The
Catholic Historical Review

VOLUME IV APRIL, 1918 NUMBER 1

A SELF-EFFACED PHILANTHROPIST: CORNELIUS HEENEY, 1754-1848

In these days of "Foundations" and "Libraries" such a title as a self-effaced philanthropist seems a positive contradiction. It must be used however in making the record of Cornelius Heeney, a layman whose name constantly recurs during the formative period of the Church in New York and Brooklyn in the closing years of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries. It is only when the details of almost every movement there for the spread of the Faith during this period are gone over that the ubiquity of his energies and the lavishness of his generosity and charity can in a measure be realized. Yet how few in the now great city know anything about him; how few ever heard his name with any sense of realizing what it means in the history of pioneer days in Catholic New York? However, any general and eager curiosity about our Catholic history is not something over which we can boast at much length; and besides, as the lamented Dr. Herbermann wrote in the *Catholic Historical Review* for October, 1916 (p. 306), "many of our Catholic histories read partly like pages of a ledger and partly like catalogues of bishops and priests." The layman, outside a few stock historic figures, is conspicuously absent. Cornelius Heeney could survey the foundations of the Church in Greater New York today and with justice paraphrase Sir Christopher Wren's famous epitaph. In establishing the Brooklyn Benevolent Society he effaced his own personality, but put himself in the front rank of practical philanthropists.

He was a curious type of the apostolic Celt who has carried the Cross to the utmost confines of the known world. Born in King's County, Ireland, in 1754, the first thirty years of his life

were spent in his native land. A relative, who was in business in Dublin, gave him a good mercantile education, so that he was well equipped to make his way in America when he determined to follow his father to the New World in 1784. After a perilous voyage he landed penniless at Philadelphia, where a Quaker named Mead gave him employment. He tarried there only a few months, and then went to New York. Here another Quaker, a shipping merchant and trader named William Backhaus, engaged him as accountant and bookkeeper in his store which was located at No. 40 Little Dock, now Water Street. In this store he had as a fellow-employe John Jacob Astor, then a porter and salesman, and subsequently the founder of the family of multi-millionaires of our own time. The William Backhaus Astor of local fame was named after the proprietor of the Little Dock Street store, who retired from business in 1797 and, going back to England to end his days, left his business to his two employes Heeney and Astor.

Their dealings were mainly in trading furs and skins, but the partnership only lasted for a short time. When they separated Astor retained the old Backhaus store and Heeney opened another in the same line, at No. 82 Water Street. He was a shrewd, cautious merchant, well knowing the value of money, and he soon acquired a competence. In those days of moderate ideas as to wealth, as he was a bachelor, his personal outlay was a trifle of his income, for which he seemed to have no other use than to further the interests of the Church and to answer the pleas of charity. St. Peter's, the first congregation in New York, it will be remembered, was organized in 1785 and Mr. Heeney was therefore one of the few assisting in this connection. Father Farmer, S.J., after a visit to New York early in 1785, wrote to Dr. Carroll: "The congregation there seems to me to be yet in a poor situation and under many difficulties. Father Whelan, since getting faculties, had only twenty odd communicants,"[1] and tradition says Heeney was among these "twenty odd." At all events, as the congregation gradually took shape and form, he became one of its leaders and was elected a trustee, a position of special importance in those days. For some time,

[1] BAYLEY, *History of the Church in New York*, p. 57.

he served as treasurer of the congregation. The trustees were elected by the pew-holders, the Protestant idea of church membership and pew-holding being interchangeable obtained also through ignorance and the effect of environment among the early Catholic congregations.

St. Peter's is one of the few Catholic congregations in the country that have archives of any comparative antiquity and the subject of pews frequently crops up in the records of its early years. At a meeting of the trustees, held on April 24, 1789, among the measures adopted was:

> That a committee consisting of Mr. Silva and Mr. Stoughton be appointed to procure a plan from Mr. Thomas Ogilvie, the carpenter, for the erecting of from forty to fifty pews in the Church and to know his lowest terms of payment and length of credit, and report the same at their next meeting.[2]

Under date of May 24, 1793, the trustees, in a petition sent to Joseph de Jaudenes and Joseph Ignatius de Viar of Philadelphia, in the hope that they would interest the King of Spain in "the particular exigencies of the Church," state that:

> The present urgencies of the Church consist in the want of funds to defray the expenses of making of an altar and pulpit, pews, galleries and other indispensable conveniences.

At the trustees' meeting on June 1, 1789, it was agreed to select four of their number who in rotation were, two and two, to take up the collection every Sunday.

> And the two trustees whose number and order it may happen to be for the Sunday collection may sit in the seat set apart for, and called the trustees' pew, and that not more than three of the trustees shall sit in the said pew at any time.

Pews and pewholders were the essential factors according to the ideals of the times, in the progress of the congregation, to which on April 16, 1794, was formally issued this notice:

> The Trustees of St. Peter's Church having determined to make Sale of the Pews of said Church, have appointed the 21st day of this Month [April] being Easter Monday for that purpose: The Sale to begin at XI o'clock, and in order to avoid all causes of jealousy and distinction

[2] José Roiz Silva was the Portuguese Consul, and Thomas Stoughton the Spanish official representative then resident in New York.

and complaint, for the time to come, have (in Vestry assembled) adopted the following rules and regulations, Viz.:

I. No preference to be given to any person whatever, but each Pew to be disposed of to the highest Purchaser, as agreed upon on the day of sale, and an annual rent to be paid for each Pew.

II. The rent of each Pew to be paid quarterly, that is to say every three months.

III. That every person put in possession of a Pew, in said Church, shall in future be deemed the right owner, and have his or her name entered in the Church Book.

IV. That on all future occasions, the subscribers shall be equally entitled to the preferences of any vacant Pews.

V. That no person, not being a subscriber, shall get a vacant Pew, whilst a subscriber, or his or her heirs, wanting a Pew shall apply for it.

VI. That the highest subscriber, at all times, wanting a Pew, or willing to exchange his Pew, shall have the preference of a vacant Pew.

VII. That no person shall be allowed to sell or give his or her Pew, to any friend or stranger, but it shall descend in right only to such relation, as would be his or her heir at law, provided such heir belong to said Church.

VIII. That every Pew vacated for three years, without a lawful claiment, shall be the property of such person, who gets it by his subscription, but if the former owner should return, such person shall be entitled to the first vacant Pew.

IX. That any person that shall be known to let his Pew, or any part thereof for more than the just value, according to the yearly rent shall be dispossessed of it, or fined as a trafficker in the Church, the fine to be given to the Poor.

X. That every person who shall neglect to pay the rent of his Pew for six months after it becomes due, shall be dispossessed and the Pew given to another.

Later a warning to all who neglected to assume their status of formal membership was promulgated in this fashion:

PUBLIC NOTICE

To all whom it may concern: Whereas the exegencies of this Church require the absolute assistance of each and every member belonging thereto in order to support said Church and defray the weighty expenses which are daily incurred, and whereas with concern we see the supine neglect in many of the members thereof in subscribing to its relief, We the Trustees of said Church, with the advice and approbation of the Rev. Pastor thereof, do declare and make known to all whom it may concern, that no person after the date hereof shall be entitled to a place in our Burial Ground, who is not found to be, as the Law prescribes, regis-

tered in the Church Books as a stated member of said Church, and a yearly subscriber of Four Dollars, which subscription is to be paid each and every quarter into the hands of the Collector of the Church.

Signed on behalf of the Trustees,

WILLIAM O'BRIEN, *Pastor.*

New York,
Jan. 6, 1796.

Of course Cornelius Heeney sat in a prominent pew, as was fitting for a man of his social and commercial standing. It was a coign of vantage whence he surveyed his fellow-worshippers and it led to a friendship with a young Austrian that in a measure influenced this young man's life. This young man was John George Gottsberger, who arrived in New York in 1801, and attended Mass at St. Peter's. One Sunday, he said in telling the story to his son, who in turn related it to me: "A little old man came up to me in St. Peter's and said, 'Young man, I've observed you hearing Mass here regularly and I wish you'd come and sit in my pew.'" The invitation was accepted and an intimacy began that prompted Heeney to take the young man to live with him in his bachelor apartments over the store in Water Street. Another friend who shared its shelter was Francis Cooper, a Philadelphian of good old Catholic stock whose name is to be found among those foremost in early New York's Catholic activities. Cooper was one of the first of the Faith to hold public office in New York, and served as a member of the State legislature in 1807, 1808, 1809, 1815 and 1826. It was when he was elected in 1806 that an obnoxious anti-Catholic oath of office was finally wiped off the statute books so that he could take his seat in the Assembly. The trustees of St. Peter's presented the petition to the legislature that brought about this reform. Mr. Heeney also took an active part in politics and as a Democrat served five terms in the Assembly, following Mr. Cooper from 1818 to 1822. As a patriotic Irishman he joined with Thomas Addis Emmet and the other exiles of the '98 rebellion to defeat the effort of Rufus King to be chosen United States Senator from New York. King, during the United Irishmen episode, was our Minister to England, and in that capacity by his own diplomatic objections tried to prevent Emmet and his fellow-prisoners in Fort George from coming to

the United States, thus keeping them in Fort George as political prisoners for a considerable period beyond the time set for their release. They retaliated by blocking his election as Senator from New York.

Cooper and Heeney were the first Catholics to hold elective offices in New York and the first Catholic members of the legislature. Cooper during his stay in New York appears to have enjoyed the confidence and esteem of his ecclesiastical superiors and to have shown himself in every way worthy of their friendship. His letters to his parents in Philadelphia, reproduced in the American Historical Society's *Records* in 1900, give interesting sidelights on New York during the first quarter of the nineteenth century.

When Father Anthony Kohlmann, S.J., was sent in 1807, by Bishop Carroll, to cure the troubles of the discordant Church in New York, he found a zealous assistant in Cornelius Heeney. "This parish," Father Kohlmann wrote, on March 24, 1809, "comprises 16,000 Catholics, so neglected in all respects that it goes beyond conception." One of his projects for the reform was to build a new church in what was then the outskirts of the upper eastern section of the city, and Old St. Patrick's, the former Cathedral, was the result. "Mr. Andrew Morris, Mr. Matthew Reid and Mr. Cornelius Heeney were among the chief contributors, as appears from Father Kohlmann's subscription book in my possession."[3] The site was a cemetery ground belonging to St. Peter's Church and the territory about it was still farmland and woods. In addition to the generous amounts he had subscribed to the building fund of the new church, Mr. Heeney gave $18,000 and a plot of ground in 1812 for an orphan asylum opposite St. Patrick's at the corner of Prince Street. Later, he added an adjoining plot. He built the free parish school for girls, gave a lot to enlarge the graveyard, and made other gifts of money and property to St. Peter's and St. Patrick's that amounted in all to about $60,000—an immense sum in those days.

In the cause of Catholic education he was especially zealous. The oldest free school in New York is that belonging to St.

[3] BAYLEY, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

Peter's parish, which was opened in accordance with these resolutions passed by the trustees on March 30, 1800:

> *Resolved*, That a free school for the education of children be and is hereby established, and that a proper master be chosen to superintend said school.
>
> Secondly, That Messrs. Morris, Neylon, Heeney and the Rev. Dr. O'Brien be and are hereby charged for the due and immediate execution of the same.[4]

When Father Kohlmann, S.J., began the New York Literary Institution, the city's first Catholic College, the title of the mansion and grounds in the then village of Elgin (now Fifth Avenue, 50th and 51st Streets, and occupied by St. Patrick's Cathedral), which he purchased for that purpose, was taken for him by Cornelius Heeney and Andrew Morris on March 6, 1810, the consideration paid for the property being $11,000. They held it until May 21, 1821, when the college project having been abandoned they sold it to Denis Doyle for $2,000 above a mortgage held by the Eagle Fire Insurance Company. Doyle used the place for a road hotel (it was on what was called the Middle Road) until 1828, when the mortgage was foreclosed, and the property sold by Court order to Francis Cooper who bought it in for $5,550 in behalf of the trustees of St. Patrick's and St. Peter's Churches to whom he conveyed it on January 30, 1829. They wanted it for a new cemetery, old St. Patrick's graveyard having filled up. All these data are from the officially recorded real estate transfers in the public register's office and effectively dispose of the oft-repeated fable that the city made a gift to the Church of the now so valuable Fifth Avenue site of St. Patrick's Cathedral.

The father of John McCloskey, the first American Cardinal, died in 1820, at his residence in Murray Street, New York, to which he had moved from Brooklyn some time previously. Mr. Heeney was made the boy's guardian. Cardinal Farley, in his *Life of Cardinal McCloskey*, relates how, after an arrangement to send the boy to Georgetown College had fallen through, he was called out of Brady's school, one day in the summer of 1822 and rushed in quite a state of trepidation to the little frame house,

[4] The first city public school was not opened until May 19, 1806.

then the Orphan Asylum in Prince Street. Here he found himself in the presence of a clergyman who, he soon learned, was Rev. Mr. Dubois, president of Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, then on a vacation tour. "Here's the boy," said a familiar voice. It was Mr. Cornelius Heeney, his guardian, who spoke. The whole affair had been settled by the good mother and Mr. Heeney that he should repair at once to Mount St. Mary's College without consulting the principal party concerned.

Mr. Heeney was also instrumental in having Mother Seton assign three of the Emmitsburg Community, Sisters Rose White, Cecelia O'Conway and Felicité Brady, in June, 1817, to found a house in New York. In the letter which their spiritual Director, Father John Dubois, wrote to Bishop Connolly in regard to this project he says: "We shall be too happy to have such men as Messrs. Fox, Cooper and Heeney, or either of them, to accompany our Sisters to New York." After the Sisters had been at work for some time in New York, in their first charge, the Orphan Asylum, they turned their attention to the demand for teachers for the large number of Catholic girls whose parents were willing and anxious to give them a sound Catholic education. Hence we find in the *Truth Teller* for July 30, 1830 a circular signed by the rector of St. Peter's, the Rev. Dr. John Power, V.G., announcing that "three of the Sisters of Charity have arrived from Emmitsburg to open a Pay School in this city for the instruction of females," and that the patrons of the school were Denis McCarthy, Francis Cooper and Cornelius Heeney. The circular reads:

> The Roman Catholics of New York have now an opportunity of giving their children an education both ornamental and useful, and what is by far more important of *bringing them up in the discipline and correction of the Lord.* To this it is hoped, they will not be indifferent, now that so favorable an opportunity presents itself. If it is of acknowledged moment that parents should engage in these duties which concern the temporal use and welfare of their offspring; if it is encumbent on them to exert their best powers to prepare them for action on the great theatre of life; to enable them to adorn those spheres in which Providence may place them, should not the most animated zeal be indulged in fixing and giving life to every moral and religious principle?
>
> In moral and religious acquirements consist the chief dignity and happiness of man—deprive him of these and you make him ignorant of the true principles and grounds of rectitude and honor and dry up the purest

sources of human joy; you degrade him in the creation and render him an improper object for the future rewards of his Maker. To finish then the characters of their offspring—to complete the circle of their principle duties in their behalf, the patronage of the Catholics of this city is respectfully solicited for this new, and it is to be hoped highly successful, establishment.

It was thus that the foundation was laid for the present secondary and higher educational system for Catholic women in New York and it is early evidence of that leadership New York has always maintained in the cause of sound Catholic education.

Cornelius Heeney's name is to be found among the subscribers who enabled the first Catholic books, Pastorini's *History of the Christian Church* to be published, by Bernard Dornin, in New York, in 1807, Duffy's *New Testament*, Georgetown, in 1817, and Rev. Dr. John Power's *New Testament*, New York, in 1824. He also helped Denman and Pardow to establish the *Truth Teller*, the first Catholic paper, in April, 1825. No doubt he also aided his protégés, the Gottsbergers, to get out New York's first magazine for Catholic children which lasted from 1838 to 1840, and had at one time 13,000 circulation.

In the list of the early members of the New York Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, Heeney's is the second Catholic name that appears (1804). Dominic Lynch's is the first. All others are those of North of Ireland Protestant merchants and professional men. It is an evidence of his social and commercial standing at that early date, and there is also testimony to his benevolent disposition in the fact that for years the society's roll includes him as one of its "Charity Committee."

That part of New York's First Ward east of Broadway and below Wall Street was destroyed by a fire that broke out on December 16, 1835. In all 648 stores and property valued at $18,000,000 were destroyed. Heeney's establishment at 82 Water Street was among the number. He did not rebuild it. His fortune in spite of his lavish gifts to charity was ample and he retired to live at his ease in a house and farm in Brooklyn on the heights overlooking the river which he had purchased for $7,500, in 1806. He had always been interested in the progress of his fellow Catholics in Brooklyn. The Catholic colony there began with the establishment of the Navy Yard

on that side of the East River in 1801. The first Mass was said for them in 1820 by the wandering Augustinian missionary, Father Philip Larisey. St. James' congregation was organized on January 1, 1823, and until this church, the first on Long Island, was ready for dedication on August 28, 1823, the people heard Mass in the "long room" of Dempsey's Blooming Grove Garden, a roadside hotel on the highway to Jamaica now Clinton and Fulton Streets, which property Cornelius Heeney owned. He offered to give land at what is now Court and Congress Streets for the first church, but the site was considered too remote. That in Jay Street where St. James' stands was taken. When Bishop Dubois' Seminary at Nyack was burned down in 1833, Heeney offered this same land to the Bishop for a new Seminary, but wanted to make the gift contingent on certain conditions, and the Bishop finally refused it, although some of the building material had already been taken to the site. The ground was finally given by Heeney for St. Paul's Church, the second erected in Brooklyn, and for the Girls' Orphan Asylum and Industrial School that adjoin it. He reserved, however, a strip of the land immediately behind the west wall of the church and here he built a vault in which he is buried. Next to it, he gave a similar vault to his friend Madame Parmentier, the widow of André Parmentier, a Belgian engineer and horticulturalist who was one of the founders of St. James' Church. He conveyed it by a formal deed that carried the right of way, easements and all the other obligations of a real-estate transfer. It was legally recorded and remained in force until the death of Miss Rosine, the last Parmentier, a charming old lady, on January 30, 1908. She and her sister Madame Bayer had devoted their lives and fortune to works of charity and the old vault was closed forever at Rosine's death and the ground willed to St. Paul's Church.

Heeney's Brooklyn residence was a Mecca for those in need; few failed in their appeals to his generosity. Children and poor widows were the special objects of his care. In spite of his years and busy life he retained all the alertness and the shrewdness that had enabled him to prosper in his business career. In 1845, he made up his mind to be his own executor, and to pro-

vide for the continuation of the benevolence that had been the predominant characteristic of most of the years of his long life. He therefore determined to establish what he called the Brooklyn Benevolent Society, which was really an incorporation of his estate.

The charter, obtained by act of the legislature of the State of New York, passed May 10, 1845, and reads as follows:

> *Section I.* Cornelius Heeney, Francis Cooper, James Friel, Henry M. Patchen, and John George Gottsberger, together with the four other persons hereinafter named, that is to say: Noel I. Becar, William H. Peck, Peter Turner and Bartlett Smith, to whom shall be added, as ex-officio Trustees, the Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of New York, for the time being, and the Mayor of the City of Brooklyn, for the time being, making eleven persons in all, shall be the Trustees of the Charity hereinafter named, and that such other persons as shall be united with them, shall be the Associates of the said Charity, and that such Trustees and Associates are hereby constituted a body corporate by the name of "The Trustees and Associates of the Brooklyn Benevolent Society."
>
> 2. The said Corporation may take and hold, by deed of gift, from Cornelius Heeney, the present owner thereof, the parcels of land in the City of Brooklyn, lying between Hicks, Columbia, Congress and Amity Streets, and may take and hold any further real and personal estate that said Cornelius Heeney may convey to it gratuitously or may bequeath or devise to it by his last will and testament.
>
> 3. The one-fifth of the rents, issues and income of the said estate and of said Corporation shall be annually expended in supplying poor persons residing in Brooklyn aforesaid gratuitously with fuel during the winter; one-tenth thereof shall also be annually expended in gratuitously supplying poor children attending school in Brooklyn aforesaid with shoes and stockings or other articles of clothing absolutely necessary for their health and protection during that season of the year. The sum of two hundred and fifty dollars out of said income shall be expended quarterly in the payment of a teacher of said poor children in spelling, reading, writing and arithmetic; and the whole clear surplus shall be applied solely to the support, maintenance and education of poor orphan children between the age of four and fourteen.

The Associates are those who contribute dues of three dollars a year to the charity and they elect the board of trustees at the annual meeting. The only salaries to be paid are a "reasonable compensation" to the treasurer and the "Agent" who carries on the business of the society. In the By-Laws the object of the society is thus detailed:

It is understood and declared by the founder and donor of this Society, by His Honor, the Mayor, and other members at their first meeting, that the funds which it may be enabled to distribute are for the relief of Catholic poor and Catholic orphans; but this understanding and declaration are not meant to prohibit the Society from relieving poor persons without distinction, when either an excess of funds, or the urgency for relief may render it necessary and expedient.

The first meeting of the Brooklyn Benevolent Society was held on August 6, 1845 and Bishop John Hughes presided. Besides Mr. Heeney there were present, Mayor T. G. Talmadge of Brooklyn, John G. Gottsberger, Bartlett Smith, James Friel, Peter Turner, and William H. Peck. Mayor Talmadge eulogized "the generous donor whose name shall be held in remembrance by a grateful people," and Mr. Heeney explained that his idea of the charity was mainly that his Catholic fellow countrymen and their families should be relieved from want, many of them on their arrival here being in absolute need of assistance. Bishop Hughes was elected president; James Friel, treasurer; William H. Peck, secretary; and Patrick Halegan, agent. Halegan was a sort of familiar who lived in the Brooklyn house with Mr. Heeney during the close of his life and exercised considerable influence over him. The life trustees named were the Bishop of New York, the Mayor of Brooklyn, *ex officio*, Cornelius Heeney, James Friel and W. H. Peck of Brooklyn; John George Gottsberger and Francis Cooper of New York; annual trustees, Peter Turner and N. J. Becar, Brooklyn; Bartlett Smith, New York. They received the formal deed transferring all Mr. Heeney's property to them on September 17, 1845. This property in time became part of the most attractive residential section of Brooklyn and has never been sold. The ground was leased for a term of twenty-one years and then built on. The renewals are made by three valuators, one chosen by the owner of the house, one by the Society and the third by these two. The income of the Society from these rents and investments has averaged from $15,000 to $25,000 a year. The cost of administration has been almost nominal, about two per cent, the rent going to charity as the charter directs. More than a million dollars have been distributed since the Society was organized. The coal and clothing is given through the St. Vincent de Paul Society in the various parishes and the surplus in cash to the

orphans cared for by the "Roman Catholic Orphan Asylum Society"—the amount usually being from $13,090 to $15,000.

The latest formal report of the Society is of interest in this connection.

The Trustees of the Brooklyn Benevolent Society submit the following statement for the year ending February 28, 1918:

Receipts

Rentals	$21,685.43
Interest on deposits	1,234.15
Interest on bonds and mortgages	566.25
Bank stock dividends	1,548.00
Members' fees	6.00
Balance from last year	3,739.91
Total	$28,779.74

Expenditures

Support of orphan children	$12,000.00
Coal for poor families	5,841.53
Shoes and stockings for the poor	4,200.17
Teacher of poor children	250.00
Counsel fees	1,000.00
Salaries	1,250.00
Taxes	181.75
Printing, stationery, gas, repairs	277.91
Total	$25,001.36
March 1, 1918, balance	3,778.38
Grand total	$28,779.74

JOSEPH F. MCDONNELL, *Treasurer.*

The Auditing Committee has examined the accounts of Mr. Joseph F. McDonnell, treasurer, and certify the same to be correct.

FRANK J. HEANEY,
EUGENE F. O'CONNOR,
Committee.

Dated, Brooklyn, March 1, 1918.

Since this report was filed an additional $5,000 was given to the Catholic Orphan Asylum Society, making a total of $17,000 during the asylum's current fiscal year. Few, if any one, of the thousands who receive this annual bounty know how it came to

them, or even the name of the man to whose generosity they are indebted for it.

Mr. Heeney continued to take an active interest in the work of the Society he thus created until a few weeks before his death. The last meeting he attended was held on March 27, 1848. He died on May 3 following. Three days later his funeral took place from St. Paul's Church with all the solemn pomp the Church ordains, after which he was buried in the vault he had built in the rear back of the sanctuary wall.

Over the grave is set a tablet surmounted by a portrait bust, and bearing this epitaph:

> *In memory of Cornelius Heeney who departed this life on the third day of May, 1848, in the 94th year of his age. Born in the King's County, Ireland, he was a citizen of the United States from the adoption of the Federal Constitution. Throughout his life he was much respected for his many Christian virtues, and was distinguished as the friend of the widow and orphan by his numerous acts of private benevolence and liberal gifts for the erection and support of institutions for their benefit; and at his death by the munificent bequest of an estate for their relief and comfort.* REQUIESCAT IN PACE. *Erected by his executors, James Friel and Peter Turner, with the concurrence of the Brooklyn Benevolent Society of which he was the founder.*

No portrait of Mr. Heeney as far as is known was ever made during his lifetime. A death mask was taken and from this a bust carved for his monument. In a paper read by the Rev. John M. Kiely, at the meeting of the United States Catholic Historical Society, on September 28, 1891, he said that from those who had known Mr. Heeney he learned that "he was about five feet nine inches in height, clean-shaven and pleasing rather than handsome of face. His forehead was a receding one and his head bald on top. His hair when long was confined behind his neck by a slight ribbon and fell over his coat collar, and to a stranger he would pass as an orthodox Quaker, even to the broad-brimmed hat and William Penn knee breeches."

The Rev. D. A. Merrick, S.J., as a boy lived in a house in Brooklyn, built on Heeney property, and in his *Recollections of an Old Fellow* (*Fordham Monthly*, January, 1906) says: "The only gentleman I ever knew who wore a pigtail was Mr. Cornelius Heeney." Mr. Frank Gottsberger, the son of Heeney's old protégé, said of his father's patron: "I remember his old home in

Brooklyn well. It stood about where Amity Street is now, between Hicks and Henry. At the west end was Mr. Heeney's sitting room where he received his visitors. He sat in a large arm-chair and it was customary for all visitors to salute him on entering the room, the ladies making a curtsey and the men and boys a bow. I remember the drilling I had to go through so that I could make a proper and polite bow. He was very particular in this regard and if any of the boys failed to make a formal salutation on their arrival at the house he would take them to task about it when they appeared before him at their departure."

He was strong-willed, self-opinionated, but not too cranky to get along with his fellows. His long tenure of office, as a trustee of St. Peter's Church in New York without getting into any serious complications with the pastors during a time when trusteeism in all its most obnoxious phases was rampant, seems to indicate that his charitable disposition extended beyond mere material donations.

After his death the Brooklyn Benevolent Society had to defend its title to the trust he created through a series of vexatious law suits brought by alleged heirs. The famous jurist Charles O'Conor was the Society's legal champion and successfully defeated these raids on its property, which during all the years has been safely and wisely administrated for the object this generous old man set it apart. He forgot himself when he gave it to charity, and the great community in which he spent so much of his long and busy life has forgotten him, though the good he did lives after him and yearly adds to the record that is imperishable for his eternal reward.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN,
New York City.

THE CENTENARY OF OHIO'S OLDEST CATHOLIC CHURCH (1818-1918)

In few of the early missions in the United States was the sowing of the seed of Catholic faith accomplished under more untoward circumstances or attended with such abject poverty, as in that of Ohio. It was a spiritual work that demanded heroic courage and a true spirit of self-sacrifice. In few of the States also has the seed of truth sown by their first missionaries borne such abundant fruit. For these reasons, the centenary of Saint Joseph's Church, near Somerset, Perry County, Ohio, which will round out the first hundred years of its existence on the sixth day of December, the current year, can hardly fail to elicit the attention of Catholics not in Ohio only, but through all the country.[1]

The first of the white race to penetrate into, or attempt settlements in, that portion of the United States comprised in what is

[1] The materials used for this article are principally: I. SOURCES. (A) MSS. *Archives of the Propaganda*, Rome; *Archives of the Master General of the Dominicans*, Rome; *Archives of the Dominican Fathers*, Haverstock Hill, London, England; *Archives of the Dominican Fathers*, Louvain, Belgium; *Archives of the Dominican Fathers*, Saint Joseph's Priory, Somerset, Ohio; *Archives of the Archdiocese of Baltimore*; *Archives of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati*; *Archives of the Maryland-New York Province of Jesuit Fathers*, Baltimore; *Archives of Notre Dame University*, Notre Dame, Indiana; *Bishop B. J. Flaget's Diary for* 1812–13; *Archives of the Diocese of Louisville*. (b) PRINTED: *A Circular Letter of Bishop Edward D. Fenwick* (in Italian), addressed to the Catholics of Italy and printed in Rome, December, 1823. II. WORKS: (A) GENERAL: BRYANT, *A Popular History of the United States*, New York, 1884–90, Vols. i and iii; CLARKE, *The Deceased Bishops of the Catholic Church in the United States*, Vol. i, New York, 1888; DECOURCY-SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, New York, 1856; DRAKE AND MANSFIELD, *Early Cincinnati*, 1826; ELSON, *History of the United States of America*, New York, 1905, Vols. i and ii; GRAHAM, *History of Fairfield and Perry Counties, Ohio*, Chicago, 1883; HOWE, *Historical Collections of Ohio*, Columbus, 1891, Vol. iii; HOUCK, *The Church in Northern Ohio and in the Diocese of Cleveland*, first edition, Benziger Bros., 1887, and second edition, Cleveland, 1890; MARTZOLFF, *History of Perry County, Ohio*, Columbus, 1902; O'DANIEL, *The Friars Preacher, A Seventh Centenary Sketch*, Somerset, Ohio, 1917, and *Very Rev. Charles Hyacinth McKenna, O.P., Missionary and Apostle of the Holy Name*, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, 1917; SHEA, *Life and Times of the Most Rev. John Carroll*, New York, 1888, and *A History of the Catholic Church in the Limits of the United States*, Vol. iii, New York, 1890; SPALDING, *Sketches of the Early Catholic Missions in Kentucky*, Louisville, 1884, and *Sketches of the Life, Times and Character of the Right Rev. Benedict Joseph Flaget*, Louisville, 1852; WEBB, *The Centenary of Catholicity in Kentucky*, Louisville, 1884; WINSOR, *Narrative and Critical History of America*, Boston and New York, Vols. iii, iv, v; VOLZ, *A Century's Record* (a

now the flourishing State of Ohio, were French. These hardy explorers made their earliest entry into this part of the New World in the second half of the seventeenth century; and, as was then the invariable custom, they were either accompanied or were soon followed by Catholic missionaries of their nation. In this instance, as in many others, the missionaries belonged to the Society of Jesus. Records show that from the time de Blainville took possession of the territory in the name of the King of France, in 1749, these good Fathers were often with the explorers; that they built a chapel for the Indians where now stands the city of Sandusky; and that they labored occasionally among the aborigines along the southern shores of Lake Erie until 1763, when the western country, as far as the Mississippi, was ceded to England.

From the time of the surrender of the Ohio Valley by the French, that part of the country was not visited by a priest until 1790, when Father Peter Joseph Didier, O.S.B., was sent to take spiritual charge of the ill-planned and ill-fated Scioto Colony. Father Didier's labors, however, were short-lived; for, finding the colonists discontented, unruly and deeply imbued with the principles of the French Revolution, after a brief sojourn at the present Gallipolis, he continued his way to Saint Louis.

pamphlet), Somerset, Ohio, 1905. (B) SPECIAL: 1888; HAMMER, *Eduard Dominik Fenwick, der Apostelvon Ohio*, Freiburg, 1890.

In addition to the above list of materials, we have consulted the *Catholic Almanac* of 1848, which has a good biographical sketch of Bishop E. D. Fenwick, O.P.; the *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*, first eight volumes, Lyons, 1828–42, under titles of *Mission du Kentucky, Mission du Michigan* and *Mission de l'Ohio;* the *United States Catholic Magazine*, 1847, three articles on: *The Catholic Church in Ohio;* the *Dominican Year Book*, 1913, article by the writer on: *Saint Rose's Priory*, Springfield, Washington County, Kentucky; the *American Catholic Historical Researches*, July, 1891, p. 98*ff*, article: *The Catholic Religion in the United States in* 1816, and other contributions on the early Church in Ohio, too numerous to mention, that have appeared in our Catholic papers. Doubtless more than one reader will remark that this article differs greatly from much that has been written on so interesting a chapter of our American church history. But, based as it is largely on documents from the hands of the first missionaries themselves and others who played a conspicuous part in the events of that remote day, there is every reason to believe that the account presents a correct outline of the pioneer missionary labors in Ohio. We regret to say that the noted historian Shea (*History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, Vol. iii, pp. 352–53), following his usual bias against the Dominicans, takes occasion of a brief misunderstanding to enkindle prejudice against those who were engaged on the early missions of Ohio.

Late in 1793, Fathers Barrieres and Stephen T. Badin, who were on their way down the Ohio River to Kentucky, tarried three days with the remnants of the Scioto Colony at Gallipolis. Again, in 1795, Rev. Edmund Burke, an Irish priest and later vicar apostolic of Nova Scotia, while with the English soldiers at Fort Miami, on the Maumee River, began a mission among the Indians in the northwestern part of the territory. But Burke's labors, like those of his predecessors, were also of short duration, ceasing with the withdrawal of the British forces which he accompanied into Canada.

No further effort was made to plant the Church's standard in what is now, in point of wealth and numbers, the fourth State of the Union, until after the dawn of the nineteenth century. In the meantime, November 29, 1802, Ohio was admitted to the rights of statehood. Its population was growing apace, and it was believed that there were many Catholics among its inhabitants. Accordingly, in 1808, Father Edward Dominic Fenwick, of the Order of Preachers and later Cincinnati's first Ordinary, in obedience to the wishes of his superiors, and probably at the request of Archbishop Carroll, left his convent home in Kentucky to penetrate into the forests of Ohio. Different dates have been assigned to Father Fenwick's first entrance upon his northern mission; but the good friar himself, in a circular letter written fifteen years later during a visit to Rome as bishop, and addressed to the people of Italy in behalf of his impoverished diocese, tells us that it was in the year we have given. The document does not mention the time of the year, but circumstances indicate that it must have been in the latter half of 1808. On this occasion, the bishop says, he found three German families (that is, of German extraction), comprising twenty individuals in all, who had not seen a priest for ten or twelve years. Deprived so long of the consolations of their religion, their joy at the visit of the missionary was inexpressible. They considered him a messenger sent by Heaven for their salvation. But the delight caused the future apostle by the discovery of the little flock he chanced upon, was not less than that of the good people themselves.[2]

[2] Our belief that Father Fenwick's first visit to Ohio was probably due in part to a request from Archbishop Carroll is based on two letters of Jacob Dittoe to that

These three families were discovered in that part of Fairfield County now included in Perry County. One of them was the family of Jacob Dittoe who had moved at an earlier date from Pennsylvania to Frederick, Maryland, whence he migrated to Ohio a few years prior to the time of which we speak, settling eventually on the farm where Fenwick found him, about a mile and a half from the present town of Somerset. It was in Dittoe's house that Father Fenwick said his first Mass in Ohio. Another was the family of John Finck who had gone to Ohio direct from Pennsylvania, and whose pioneer home stood where now is the east end of Somerset, near the present public school. The name of the third family is shrouded in some obscurity, but was probably that of Joseph Finck. Father Fenwick had been but lately released, at his own request, from the position of superior of the little band of Dominicans he had led out to Kentucky two years before. Freed from this burden and eager to give himself up to the life of an itinerant pioneer missionary, he promised his newly discovered flock in the wilds of Ohio that he would visit them occasionally and administer to their spiritual needs. The zealous friar's ministerial duties in Kentucky, however, the office of syndic which he held at the struggling new convent of Saint Rose and the college of Saint Thomas attached to that institution, and the some seven hundred miles that he had to travel on horseback to and from this part of Ohio, caused his journeys to the north to be less frequent then he would have liked.

A well-defined tradition still existing among the Catholics of

---

distinguished prelate. Both have the postmark of Lancaster, Ohio. One bears the date of January 5, 1805; the other that of February 1, 1808; and they are in the Baltimore diocesan archives, Case 3, D7 and 8. The first requests Doctor Carroll to make application to Congress for a section of land, (in Range 17, Township 17, and section 21), to be used for church purposes and to be granted by or purchased from the United States. The second seeks to enlist the archbishop's interest in obtaining aid to hold a tract of land that had been secured for the Church, and tells him the prospects of maintaining a priest in Ohio. Bishop Fenwick's circular letter to the people of Italy was printed, with the permission of Leo XII, at Rome, December 13, 1823. It authorizes Father John Grassi, S.J., rector of the Royal Collegio del Carmine, Turin, to accept alms for the Diocese of Cincinnati. This was probably the Father Grassi who had previously been president of Georgetown College, D. C., and was an intimate friend of the bishop.

that part of Perry County, and which is found recorded in writings that date back to within a few years after Bishop Fenwick's death, tells us that the hard-working missionary made from one to two visits a year to keep alive the faith of the Catholics he had found in the north. But we have no further documentary evidence of his presence there until we find a letter from Jacob Dittoe to Archbishop Carroll, bearing the date of New Lancaster, August 19, 1810, and indicating that Father Fenwick had been at Somerset earlier in that year or in the preceding year, if not in both. Tradition tells us also that it was in 1810 that the first Mass was said within the present corporate limits of the town of Somerset, and that it was celebrated by Father Fenwick in the house of John Finck, whose name has been mentioned.[3]

From 1810 until May 25, 1812, we have no further letters. But at this latter date Father Fenwick writes to Jacob Dittoe from Springfield, Kentucky, expressing his regret at having been prevented for so long from going to the spiritual assistance of the little Catholic colony; he gives the causes that deterred him and promises that he and Bishop Flaget will be in Ohio in August or September. Doubtless Father Fenwick was to accompany

[3] In an article on Saint Rose's Priory, Springfield, Kentucky, for the *Dominican Year Book*, 1913, we maintained that 1810 was most probably the year in which Father Fenwick made his first visit to Ohio. Later study, however, seems to show conclusively that he was in the State as early as 1808. The tradition of which we spoke in the *Year Book*, as we have since learned, regards the first Mass said in the town limits of the present Somerset (in John Finck's house), rather than the beginnings of the missionary's labors in the north. Only a few weeks ago, Peter J. Dittoe of Baltimore, a grandson of Jacob Dittoe, told the writer that he had often heard his father, whose name was also Peter, speak of how Father Fenwick had discovered the old family home by the sound of an axe in the forests, and of how glad the pioneers were to see a priest come among them. The circumstances of the discovery were precisely those that have not only been handed down by tradition, but recorded in early accounts of Catholicity in Ohio and expressed in the well-known picture representing the missionary finding and blessing the Catholic backwoodsmen of Perry County. The first Peter Dittoe was fifteen years of age at the time, and the men of the family who had moved some months earlier in the same year (1808) to the farm on which Fenwick discovered them, were engaged in felling trees near the home for outbuildings. This story is further corroborated by the date (March 1, 1808) of the grant of a quarter section of land to Jacob Dittoe. The deed is now in possession of Peter J. Dittoe of Baltimore. Jacob Dittoe's letter referred to here is in the diocesan archives of Baltimore, Case 8a, F. 4. The name Finck is now frequently written Fink.

the bishop, as far as Ohio at least, on his way to a Council that was to be held in Baltimore. This plan, however, was changed, and Rev. Stephen T. Badin went with Doctor Flaget—a circumstance which, together with a letter of Fenwick written to Kentucky's veteran missionary (Badin) in 1823, has led some erroneously to conclude that the bishop was the discoverer of the three families mentioned above and the first to offer up the holy sacrifice of the Mass at Somerset.[4]

The next document bearing on this early Catholic settlement in Ohio is also from Fenwick. It is dated: Georgetown, Kentucky, April 20, without the year; but it evidently belongs either to 1815 or 1816. It contains the same story of regret and unavoidable absence as the letter of which we have just spoken.[5] About this latter date, however, we find the tireless Friar Preacher giving up the missions in Kentucky to devote himself entirely to the still more desolate Church of Ohio. In Kentucky he had practically lived in the saddle for seven or eight years, going from place to place "in search of stray sheep," to employ a phrase that has been canonized from its use by the saintly apostle of Ohio. In the north his lot was even more lonely and trying. A man of boundless energy, he made Somerset the centre of his apostolic activities, traversed and re-traversed the almost unbroken primeval forest of Ohio in all directions and throughout the length and breadth of the State. Doubtless it was in part Fenwick's labors in Ohio that caused Father John Grassi, S.J., to write of the little band of Dominicans in Kentucky in 1816, that "they try to remedy this want [of numbers and means]

[4] The letter of Father Fenwick to Dittoe referred to here is in the Archives (not indexed) of Saint Joseph's Priory, Somerset, Ohio. That to Badin is given in the *Catholic Almanac* of 1848 (pp. 62–65), is dated: Bordeaux, August, 1823, and contains the words: "When I first went to the state of Ohio, nine years ago, I discovered only three Catholic families from Limestone (Maysville) to Wheeling." From this some have drawn the conclusion that the date of Fenwick's first entrance into Ohio is 1814. But it is evident from what has been said both in this article and in the *Dominican Year Book* for 1913, that the words "nine years ago" are certainly an oversight, or a mechanical error for "fifteen years ago." It is quite probable that the form in which this letter of Fenwick was first given to the public was a French translation; that the *London Spectator* (Vol. i, p. 350), from which the *Catholic Almanac* copies, translated it back into English; and that the error occurred in one or the other of these translations.

[5] *Archives of Saint Joseph's Priory*, Somerset, Ohio.

by edifying industry." The knowledge of their splendid efforts in the cause of religion having reached England, Father P. N. Sewell, S.J., wrote to an American confrère: "The Dominicans are doing great things for the glory of God in Kentucky, on the Ohio, etc. Let us emulate them and renew the zeal of our forefathers."[6]

Early in his career as a missionary in Ohio Father Fenwick was proffered by Jacob Dittoe, the State's first Catholic benefactor, three hundred and twenty acres of land near Somerset, on the condition that a church and a house of the Order, for the education of young men for the institute, be erected thereon. The missionary gladly accepted this generous offer, with the permission of his superior and Bishop Flaget, and he was anxious to carry out the intention of the donor. In the meantime, however, the growth of the State's population was phenomenal, while the great number of German and Irish Catholics who came into its territory to occupy the virgin soil, multiplied the zealous priest's labors almost to the breaking point. Thus he had not even leisure, until the arrival of assistance, to give the project the little time required for building a small, primitive wooden church sufficient to accommodate the few scattered Catholics who lived in that vicinity. In this way, some years were to pass before he saw the realization of his cherished design. But we cannot do better than let Father Fenwick tell, in his own interesting way, of his toils and trials both in Ohio and in Kentucky. Writing from Georgetown, D. C., to a friend in London, England, November 8, 1818, he says:

> It is now two years since I have lived in the Convent of Saint Rose in Kentucky, having become, as they call me here, an itinerant preacher. I am continually occupied in traversing these immense tracts of country, either in search of stray sheep or to distribute the "bread of angels" to thousands of persons who live scattered about in these our vast solitudes. The whole State of Ohio and a part of Kentucky, from Frankfort, Lexington and Richmond to Cincinnati, Canton, and on to Cleveland on Lake Erie, are the places to which I make my apostolic travels, not neglecting the adjacent counties and cities. In the State of Ohio, which has a

[6] *American Catholic Historical Researches*, July, 1891, p. 103; Rev. P. N. Sewell, S.J., (Stonyhurst?), England, September 22, 1824, to Rev. Enoch Fenwick, Georgetown College (Archives of the Maryland-New York Province of Jesuit Fathers, Baltimore, Case 206, K. 14).

> population of 500,000 souls, there is not a single priest [that is, not a single secular priest, or a priest with a home of his own]. There are Germans and Irish who do not know any English at all. Hence you can well imagine the pains I have to take, and the efforts I have to make to be understood by them and to understand them, and to offer them some little spiritual help. It often happens that I am compelled to traverse vast and inhospitable forests, wherein not a trace of a road is to be seen. Not infrequently, overtaken by night in the midst of these, I am obliged to hitch my horse to a tree, and, making a pillow of my saddle, I recommend myself to God and go to sleep, with bears on all sides. However, our Lord in His mercy lightens these trying experiences for me, and sweetens them with sensible consolations. A short time ago, a colony of thirteen families, having by chance found a Catholic book, conceived the desire of embracing our holy religion; and although I was three hundred miles away, they wrote me a letter, in which they made their desire known to me. I made my way to this colony, which I had the good fortune to find, instructed them all in those things that are necessary to be known, and had the consolation of baptizing them. The people in general are anxious to learn, and disposed to receive the Word of God with docility. What a pity, though, that there are so few laborers. Our convent of Saint Rose is not without its needs, and the community is not large enough to send missionaries to such distant places. Our five newly-ordained priests, by their piety and talents, do honor to the Order and Religion. . . .[7]

Such were the beginnings of Father Fenwick's labors in the north—labors that were to earn for him the richly merited title of "Apostle of Ohio." By this time, however, he had been joined by his nephew, Father Nicholas Dominic Young, O.P., who was ordained in Kentucky late in 1817 and who was assigned to the northern missions the following year. Hence the future bishop of Ohio, having told his friend in London that the Fathers of Saint Rose's in Kentucky, besides their college and "a large congregation" there, "have the care of eight distant missions," proceeds to say:

> I am at present in charge of the mission at St. Joseph's with a young confrère. I built that new church, and hope before long to establish a convent there. Besides, I am now building another church and convent near Lancaster, Fairfield County, three hundred acres of land hav-

[7] *Diario di Roma*, January 23, 1819. The *Diario* says this letter was written to a gentleman in London, but does not give the name of the addressee. The extracts published from it were translated into Italian for the *Diario;* and the translation from Italian back into English which we were obliged to use, since we could not find either the *Diario* or the original, does not seem to have been well done.

> ing been given to me for that holy purpose. . . . I have been obliged, to my great sorrow, to refuse other similar offers for want of missionaries. Pray the Lord to inspire some pious and zealous priests with the holy resolution to come and join us in order to co-operate in such a meritorious work, and to propagate the light of our holy faith among people whose only desire is to be instructed. I must not conceal from you that we are in need of sacred vessels, vestments, missals, and everything that is required that the Divine Services may be conducted with the greatest possible reverence.

The church at Lancaster was given the name of Saint Mary in honor of the Mother of God. About the same time a third temple of prayer was erected just outside the confines of Cincinnati, where there was a law forbidding the existence of a Catholic church within the municipal limits, and was placed under the patronage of Ireland's apostle, Saint Patrick. Indeed, the expression "*sopra l'Ohio*" found in the rendition of Fenwick's letter into Italian for the *Diario di Roma* would suggest that the missionary must have mentioned this church, and that it was overlooked in the translation. Both these houses of prayer were plain barn-like structures of plank, and seem to have been completed and blessed in 1819. Saint Patrick's was forty-five feet in length by thirty in width; and Saint Mary's was somewhat smaller. Both were without ceiling and unplastered. The convent at Lancaster, owing to the circumstances of the times, was never completed, and the ground on which it was to have been built was later ceded to Archbishop Purcell for the diocese.[8]

Saint Joseph's near Somerset, built on the farm donated by Jacob Dittoe, was a log cabin twenty-two feet long by eighteen in width, and of the same character as the ordinary home of the pioneer settlers of the country. The bare ground served as a floor, while an opening in each side-wall answered for windows. Means of heating in the winter it had none; but a little log structure called "the warming house" stood near by, and was a blessing to the woodsmen who came from afar, before entering the

[8] While it seems certain that Father Fenwick intended to erect a convent at Lancaster, it does not appear that he obtained so much land at that place as is stated in the *Diario di Roma*. For this reason, we are inclined to believe that the translator, unacquainted with the geography of Ohio, confused the property bestowed upon Fenwick at Lancaster with that given him by Jacob Dittoe near Somerset.

church or before starting on their homeward journey. Like its younger twin sisters, Saint Joseph's lacked everything conducive to comfort or ornamentation. All three were an index of the wide-spread poverty that prevailed in the state and oppressed its early white inhabitants. Yet, though diminutive in size and primitive in construction, they were large enough to accommodate, for the moment, and elegant enough not merely to satisfy, but even to delight the few scattered Catholics.

From Maryland, whence he wrote the letter we have just quoted, and where he probably had gone in the hope of procuring a few necessaries for his new churches in Ohio, Father Fenwick hastened back to Somerset to bless and open Saint Joseph's for divine service. The impressive event, which marks an era in the history of the Catholic Church in Ohio, took place on December 6, 1818, and drew a large and curious audience of every shade of religious belief from miles around. To those of the faith it was the occasion of much delight and edification. But the joy of the good Catholic people, who now numbered ten families, at finally having a house of prayer and temple of God in their midst was no greater than that of Fathers Fenwick and Young, the two priests who officiated at the solemn ceremony.

Thus was blessed and consecrated to God Ohio's oldest Catholic church—the mother, in a sense, of all the ecclesiastical edifices, great and small, now scattered through the length and breadth of the State, and the first fruit of the zealous Dominican's apostolic labors in the north. For these reasons, to the end of his days, it has been said, Bishop Fenwick could not speak of this event or of the discovery of the three Catholic families, of whom mention has been made, without his eyes filling with tears. The discovery of these families was the nativity of the Church in Ohio; Perry County its cradle; Edward Dominic Fenwick its apostle. Or, as it has been aptly expressed:

> Here is our own State [is a] center of Catholic piety . . . that, in other States, would have made Catholicism famous and honored. At old St. Joseph's priory and novitiate, in Perry county, the Dominicans have a historic shrine that should draw the hearts of every Catholic of Ohio, for St. Joseph's was largely the cradle of Catholicity in Ohio. From its rude log church rode forth with scrip and saddle-bags the brave Dominican Fathers who, in the forests yet unhewn by the axe of the

immigrant and yet echoing to the whoop of the red man and the voice of panther and wolf, laid the foundation of the Church in Ohio.[9]

Along with the church of Saint Joseph there arose a convent that was given the same name. It was blessed at the same time as the diminutive house of worship, and was built that the Fathers might have a home they could call their own. Like the church, this pioneer monastery was a log structure, two rooms in length and a story and a half in height with an additional one-story room in the rear for a kitchen. Like the church again, the convent was bare of every ornament, with the exception of a fine oil painting of the "Descent from the Cross," which had been presented to Father Fenwick by Archbishop Carroll as a token of esteem, and which the missionary first took to Kentucky, but afterwards carried to his proto-Ohio mission. The painting, which still continues to be cherished at Saint Joseph's in memory of the institution's founder, hung on the rough, bare wall of the parlor, and was an object of wonder to the simple pioneer settlers. Not only had the Fathers, during the rare intervals they were at home, to rest content with few comforts; often they had barely the things that were considered as necessaries of life even in that hardy day. Yet they were joyous in the possession of a home of their own, and in the realization that their efforts for the good of religion had now begun to bear permanent fruit.

Happy in these thoughts and sustained by the prospects before them, the two priests, instead of suffering themselves to be discouraged by the difficulties that confronted them on all sides, redoubled their energies and their efforts in the cause of Christ. Indeed, Father Nicholas D. Young, as a reward of his long, tireless and fruitful labors on the missions, deserves the title of co-apostle of Ohio. It is in this spirit that we find Father Fenwick writing from Georgetown College, D. C., June 1, 1820, to his old-time friend, Father John Augustin Hill, O.P., then in Rome, but afterwards one of Ohio's noted missionaries and pulpit orators:

> . . . I am settled, with a confrère, Father Dominic Young, in Ohio (near Somerset, Perry County), where we have a splendid prospect of establishing our Holy Order; for we are the only ecclesiastics in the

[9] The *Catholic Columbian*, Columbus, Ohio, June 9, 1916.

entire state, which has about three thousand Catholics scattered, like so many stray sheep, over an extent of territory of from seven hundred to eight hundred miles. Such is the theater of our mission. So you see: *Messis quidem multa, operarii autem pauci. Rogate ergo . . .* [The harvest indeed is great, but the laborers are few. Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that He send forth laborers into His Harvest]. Our flock is composed principally of German and Irish Catholics. We are in great need of a German priest, for the greater number are genuinely German, having emigrated within the past few years. But we want only truly apostolic men—men willing to bear the burdens of the heat and cold, of fatigue and thirst, and content to traverse mountains and valleys in search of these lost sheep: "*qui non quaerunt quae sua sunt, sed quae Jesu Christi*" [Who seek not the things that are their own, but the things that are Jesus Christ's]. . . . I hope you will strive to recruit and to bring as many *suitable laborers* as you can to our assistance in the Lord's vineyard.[10]

The missionary then proceeds to tell his friend how glad he is that he (Hill) is enjoying the blessing of receiving his ecclesiastical education in the Capital of Christendom and so near the Order's General; what will be expected of him when he comes to America; the prospects of having a Dominican bishop in Ohio, since the Ordinary of Kentucky, Doctor Flaget, has proposed Father Wilson, the provincial, for an episcopal see to be erected at Cincinnati; and the great need of the Fathers for breviaries, missals, vestments, and church supplies, requesting him to procure for them as many of these necessaries for religion as he could. Returning to the subject of the Ohio missions, the holy priest writes again:

The Church and house where we [that is, he and Father N. D. Young] live are dedicated to Saint Joseph. Here we have a goodly estate—a farm of three hundred and twenty acres. We have another church or chapel, called Saint Mary's, twenty miles distant from these [that is at Lancaster]; and a third at Cincinnati, one hundred and fifty miles away, which is under the patronage of Saint Patrick. But we have not enough vestments, chalices and furnishings for one place. At Saint Joseph's we barely manage to make out with one chalice and a few old vestments

[10] *Propaganda Archives, America Centrale*, Vol. iv, No. 151. This volume is not paginated or folioed. Carl Russell Fish (*Guide to the Materials for American History in Roman and Other Italian Archives*) numbered its documents for his own convenience, and we have followed his numbering. The Propaganda Archives have only a French translation of parts of the letter. Unable to find the original, we were obliged to use this translation.

belonging to Saint Rose's. These three churches have been erected within the last fifteen [?] months. Since coming to this State, we could have built four or five more chapels, in different places, if we had had the means of constructing them. We are offered lands and lots in cities for this purpose, but such is the scarcity of money, the indifference of the times, and the want of charity in this regard, that we are unable to collect the funds necessary to build. In a word, we are totally without pecuniary resources, and have to depend solely on Divine Providence and the liberality of certain ones who have, up to the present, aided us in every way. . . .

Imbued with the spirit of their Order and carrying out its best traditions, the two missionaries sought in every legitimate way to keep alive the spark of faith in their widely scattered flock, to bring others into the one fold, to build up Catholic centres by inducing those of their religious convictions in the east who might be contemplating taking up homes in the new west, to settle in the same localities. In all these efforts they were eminently successful. A fruitful source of conversions employed by them was the custom of preaching everywhere and on all manner of occasions. Another was the practice, whenever they met on their apostolic journeys, of holding public discussions, one advancing the objections then in vogue against the Church and her doctrine, the other answering them. Still a third was the use of leaflets, explanatory of Catholic teaching and doubtless printed on the little pioneer press then in existence at Saint Rose's, in Kentucky. These leaflets they scattered broadcast. Controversies with non-Catholics were not infrequent. But the Fathers generally sought to avoid such intellectual bouts, for it was felt that they tended to deepen prejudice, and were often an occasion of further misunderstanding, if not ill-will, rather than of any real and lasting good. More than likely the following circular letter addressed by a committee in Cincinnati to Archbishop Maréchal and bearing the date of September 25, 1820, like many others of its kind, was written under the inspiration of the missionaries:

We, the Roman Catholic committee of this city, beg leave to inform you, that about thirty miles from hence, on the East branch of the little Miami river, there have several families of the Catholic faith established themselves on a body of fertile lands, purchased by them from William Lyttle, Esq., who, in order to encourage settlers of our faith, has with

that liberality for which he stands distinguished, granted a considerable tract of land for the use and benefit of a Roman Catholic church to be established there, in addition to which several of the settlers have contributed portions of land contiguous to the same, so as to form a respectable fund for the above pious purpose.

It having hitherto been [a] matter of deep regret and bitter disappointment to many of our countrymen, that on settling in the western wilds of this country, they have been deprived of the comforts and benefits arising from the exercise of our holy religion, we consider it of prime importance to give information to such persons as are inclined to emigrate hither, that on the extensive tracts of land, of first rate quality now on sale by Mr. Lyttle, all of which are situated on the waters of the East branch of the little Miami river, and are either intersected by, or contiguous to, the state road from hence to Chilicothe, they may have the opportunity of augmenting the number of Roman Catholic settlers under well founded hopes, that a regular and permanent establishment will speedily be made, of a church and a pastor, so much to be desired by every Christian.

It may be further necessary to state that Mr. Lytle (*sic*) is determined to give encouragement to Roman Catholics and that he appears to us disposed to give them most liberal encouragement to purchasers of our communion as well on his lands above alluded to, as on his other property. And also that we have lately succeeded in the establishment of a respectable Roman Catholic church in this town, which unhappily had been so long deprived of that important benefit. Our object, therefore, in this and similar addresses is to inform emigrants of these circumstances, in order that they may not by religious considerations be deterred from endeavouring to better their fortunes by coming to the western country—either by settling on the above land as agriculturists or in this town as mechanics or men of business. [Signed] P. Reilly, John White, William Boyle, James W. Byrne, Michael Scott, Edward Lynch, John Sherlock, James Gorman, Thomas Duran [? Dugan], P. Cazelles [? Cassilly], Michael Moran.[11]

It has been seen how the needs of the Church in Ohio, as well as the labors of the Friar Preacher in the cause of souls there, had attracted the attention of Doctor Flaget, how he realized the necessity of having an episcopal see erected in Cincinnati, and how he had intended to ask Pius VII to appoint the provincial of the Dominicans, Father Samuel T. Wilson, to this responsible position. But as a search in the Archives of the Propaganda failed to reveal any document containing such a proposal, it would seem that the good bishop changed his mind

[11] *Baltimore Archives*, Case 22, B. 1.

on the question of the State's first Ordinary, and that the learned and holy friar's name was never sent to Rome in that connection.

The reasons for such a change were probably due to the fact that Wilson, besides being advanced in age, was pre-eminently a scholar, accustomed for years to study and to the direction of students rather than to the active life of a pioneer missionary, and that Doctor Flaget was unwilling to lose a clergyman whom he considered a shining light in his diocese. He, therefore, began to look for others from whom to choose Ohio's first spiritual head. The two who appealed to him especially, were Fathers Demetrius A. Gallitzin and Edward D. Fenwick. Accordingly, he proposed them to the Holy See as priests worthy to wear the mitre of Cincinnati. Gallitzin was selected by Flaget largely because of his knowledge of German, the language spoken by many of the Catholics in the north; Fenwick because of his zeal and effective missionary labors in that part of the country. Archbishop Maréchal, at first, sent the names of Bishop David and Father Fenwick, saying of the latter, that he had done great work in that portion of the Lord's vineyard, and was certainly a learned and prudent man, as well as a priest noted for his piety and zeal. But two months later, when he had studied the matter more thoroughly, he wrote again, withdrawing the name of David and proposing only that of Fenwick, whom he declared to be the fittest of the candidates mentioned to direct the destinies of the proposed diocese.[12]

Totally unaware, it seems certain, of the steps the hierarchy were taking for the welfare of the Church in Ohio, the two missionaries continued their heroic efforts both to foster its growth, and to encourage and save souls. More than once they sought help from their brethren in Kentucky; but the needs of Saint Thomas's College attached to Saint Rose's Priory and the strong opposition of Bishop Flaget to priests departing from that portion of his diocese made it impossible for their superior to send them succor. So they were obliged to toil on singlehanded until they were rejoiced, in the summer of 1821,

[12] Bishop Flaget, Bardstown, November 6, 1820, to the Prefect of the Propaganda (*Propaganda Archives, America Centrale*, Vol. iv, No. 139); Archbishop Maréchal, Baltimore, April 4, 1820, to same (*ibid*, No. 148); same to same, June 28, 1820 (*Propaganda Archives, Acta* of 1821, folio 272a).

by the arrival at Saint Joseph's of recruits from Europe, who were on their way to Saint Rose's, but who were later to give their services and their zeal to the missions in the north. These new recruits were Father John Augustin Hill, Brothers John Thomas Hynes and John Baptist Vincent DeRaymacker, both ready for ordination, and Daniel Joseph O'Leary, a young Irishman who had nearly completed his studies in Rome, but had not yet made his religious novitiate. The three students had been gathered together by Father Hill for the new American province of Friars Preacher.

A little later in the same year, news was received which, while it brought joy to the Catholics of Ohio, filled the heart of the State's apostle with consternation. This was that bulls had come to Bishop Flaget erecting Cincinnati into an episcopal see, appointing Father Fenwick its first Ordinary, and placing Michigan and the Northwest Territory under his jurisdiction. The humble friar had no fear of labor, but he dreaded honors and distinctions almost as much as he dreaded sin. His first thought, therefore, was how to escape the mitre. The thought of having to wear one was such a shock to his humility, it is said, that he buried himself in the forests of Ohio, and it was with difficulty that he could be found. When found, it required all the persuasion and authority of his ecclesiastical superiors to induce him to bow to what all, except himself, felt to be the will of God.

Father Fenwick was raised to the episcopal dignity by Doctor Flaget on January 13, 1822; and the consecration, which was the second function of the kind performed west of the Alleghany Mountains, took place in Saint Rose's, Kentucky, a church that the good friar himself had built. A few weeks later, at the same place, he ordained four young men of his Order to the priesthood—Fathers Thomas Martin, John Hyacinth McGrady, J. T. Hynes and J. B. V. DeRaymacker, all of whom were to do efficient service for the Church in Ohio. Then, having gathered together whatever articles the Fathers of Saint Rose's could give him, and having taken up a subscription among his friends to meet the travelling expenses of himself and co-laborers, as well as the outlay which he should have to incur in settling in Cincinnati, the new bishop started for his diocese, carrying his entire episcopal retinue and equipage in a dilapidated two-horse farm-wagon that

had been donated by his convent. He was accompanied by Fathers S. T. Wilson, Hynes, McGrady and DeRaymacker. The journey, owing to rain and swollen streams, was uncommonly rough even for that remote day. Their wagon broke down, and they were in danger of being drowned in the Kentucky River. But the good prelate's trials did not stop here. In Ohio, what remained of the four or five hundred dollars in paper money that he had collected in Kentucky, was depreciated by one half. Undismayed either by this series of misfortunes or by the hardships with which he was confronted on all sides, Bishop Fenwick proceeded to rent a temporary home, to purchase a lot, and, now that the law forbidding the existence of a Catholic church within the municipal limits of Cincinnati had been repealed, to move the little frame structure that had stood on the outskirts, into the city to be his first cathedral. But this, too, threatened to fall apart whilst in transit, and it was with much difficulty that it was saved.[13]

Father Wilson's purpose in accompanying the bishop was to be his vicar general and to found a college and a house of his Order in the new episcopal city. Indeed, it was determined to send most of the Fathers to Ohio, to make that State the chief centre of the province's activities, and to use Saint Rose's principally as a simple novitiate—perhaps to give up the place altogether, since Kentucky was comparatively well supplied with missionaries. Here again, Bishop Flaget interposed, and obtained a letter from the Propaganda obliging the province to divide its forces between the two dioceses—an ill-advised step that not only retarded the growth of the Church in Ohio, but crippled the Fathers' power for good for many years. It was this order, together with his own extreme indigence, that caused Doctor Fenwick, 1823–1824, to take his well-known journey to the Eternal City to make his needs known to the Holy Father and to obtain help. His poverty may be judged by the fact that he was obliged to borrow all the money required for his expenses. Wherever the pious prelate went, he created so profound an impression that he received a warm welcome alike from the Pope and cardinals in

[13] Notes on Saint Joseph's Province of Dominicans in the United States of America by Rev. J. B. V. DeRaymacker (*Archives of the Dominican Fathers*, Louvain, Belgium—not indexed); *Catholic Almanac of* 1848, p. 58*ff*.

Rome and from the hierarchy, clergy and nobility of Europe. The French Association for the Propagation of the Faith was particularly kind and generous to him. Indeed, it is quite probable that the assistance Bishop Fenwick received from this society, led a few years later, to the establishment of a similar organization in Austria, known as the Leopoldine Association, which continued to do so much good for our young American Church long after the good prelate's death.

To follow Doctor Fenwick in his travels through Europe, or to attempt to trace his labors for souls and for his diocese, both in Ohio and in the northwest, after his return to America, would carry us far beyond our allotted space. Suffice it, then, to say that the financial aid which he obtained abroad, although it was by no means commensurate with his needs, enabled him to do much for the material betterment of his diocese and it strengthened his courage to continue his spiritual toils. Of even greater importance than this were the priests whom his piety, gentlemanly manners and priestly zeal drew to his cause, both then and in succeeding years. Those of his own Order he placed mostly in Ohio; the others labored principally in the northwest. While the money the bishop obtained in Europe was soon exhausted, leaving him as poor as ever, his hardworking missionaries remained to cheer his spirits, to sustain his energy, and to quicken his zeal.

In spite of his poverty and ill health, the small number of priests at his disposal and pastoral cares sufficient to appall a much younger and more robust man, the zealous prelate started a college for the Catholic education of youth, conducted a seminary for the fostering of sacerdotal vocations, bought a printing press and edited the *Catholic Telegraph* for the spread of Catholic truth and the defense of the Church. This paper is still in existence, and is now the oldest Catholic journal in the United States. Nor did he forget the orphan or neglect the interests of the female portion of his flock. To this end he sought in every way to introduce the Sisterhoods into his diocese, finally succeeding in the permanent establishment of the Daughters of Charity of Mother Seton in Cincinnati,[14] and of the Dominican Sisters at

[14] *Cf.* Mary Agnes McCann, *History of Mother Seton's Daughters, the Sisters of Charity of Cincinnati.* Two Vols. New York, 1917.

Somerset. His thirst for souls knew no distinction of race or nationality. The salvation of the Indians under his charge was a subject to which he gave much serious thought. Upon the red man, indeed, Bishop Fenwick seems to have bestowed a special affection, and he would gladly have laid aside the mitre to labor among them as a simple missionary. As far as the writer has been able to ascertain, he was the first of our hierarchy to attempt to foster vocations among the aborigines, sending two Indian youths to the College of the Propaganda, Rome. One of these, however, died before finishing his studies; while the other, discouraged by the death of his companion, failed to persevere.

Thus toiled on the apostle of Ohio, traversing his vast diocese and doing good to all that he might bring all nearer to Christ, until the day of his death. He passed to his reward, September 26, 1832, dying as he had lived, on one of his apostolic journeys and almost in the stage-coach. His demise brought sorrow to all the land, but particularly to that part which was under his spiritual guidance. It may be doubted if any member of our hierarchy has ever been better known, more deeply or truly loved and venerated by his people.

It is now time to return to the century-old Saint Joseph's Church and Convent, and briefly to trace their part in the early history of Ohio's Catholicity. Saint Joseph's was at once the domicile of the Fathers and the centre from which they went forth to evangelize the State. Down to the time of Bishop Fenwick's death, few besides the Friars Preacher labored in the cause of the Church there. But their activity was not confined to the limits of Ohio. Often we find them penetrating into what are now the commonwealths of Indiana, Michigan and Wisconsin. Like their chief, Doctor Fenwick, they were seldom to be found at home. Like him again, or even like our Master, they were the poorest of the poor. Their clothing, of necessity, was scanty and of the coarse homespun worn by the most destitute of the pioneer settlers. Often they were obliged to go almost barefoot in the cold winter months. Their food was in keeping with their raiment.

Yet these men of God never lost their courage; neither did they abate their zeal. Toiling ever on, they traversed and re-trav-

ersed the State in every direction. Their travels, their labors and spirit of self-sacrifice remind one of the early days of their Order. The number of conversions to the faith made by them was extraordinary. Perhaps, indeed, none of our early missions can boast of so many. Father Hill, a convert, an erstwhile officer of the English army, and an orator of the first merit, was specially fitted for this good work. He was, perhaps, the equal of Bishop Fenwick, who was possessed of an instinctive talent for dealing with his fellow Americans, and whose humility and frank, open, sincere character disarmed all opposition.

Deep and well did these Friars Preacher lay the foundations of Catholicity in Ohio; thoroughly did they prepare the soil; carefully did they sow, watch, water and cultivate the seed of faith which was later to bear such abundant fruit. From the time of the blessing and opening of Saint Joseph's, especially from the consecration of Bishop Fenwick, churches sprang up here and there in rapid succession for the day and the circumstances then prevailing. God blessed their work. Today Saint Joseph's can claim, in some sense, the honored title of mother to the Archdiocese of Cincinnati, to the three flourishing Dioceses of Cleveland, Columbus and Toledo, and to the hundreds of churches, both great and small, scattered throughout the length and breadth of the State. So, too, may she glory in the long list of her superiors that would do honor to the Church in any land; the great, learned and holy men who have made their home within her hallowed walls; the bishops she has given to the American hierarchy; the missionaries she has sent forth to preach the Gospel and teach the word of truth throughout the length and breadth of the land.

V. F. O'DANIEL, O.P.,
Washington, D. C.

REV. ANTHONY KOHLMANN, S. J. (1771-1824)

The name of Anthony Kohlmann occurs in Catholic historical records often enough to arouse the interest of students: in Europe at the end of the eighteenth century as one of the Fathers of the Sacred Heart, and of the Jesuits in White Russia; and later, in Rome, as professor at the Roman College, where we find among his pupils such men as Leo XIII and Cardinal Cullen. To the American student, however, the interest chiefly lies between these two periods, in his connection with events in New York and Washington in the early years of the Republic. Among his own brethren, he is in honor as one of the founders of their present organization in the United States, and to the more general student he is the link between the first and second Bishops of New York, and a pioneer Catholic educator in two cities. Still other interesting connections are with such varied personages as De Witt Clinton and Mother St. Euphrasia Pelletier, Tom Paine and Cardinal McCloskey. Coming to this country to be professor of philosophy, it is safe to say that as an administrator and a theologian, he is to be received as one whose influence and learning entitle him to a place among such men as Carroll, Cheverus, Fenwick, Maréchal and others in moulding the course of the Church in America.

He was born on July 13, 1771, at Kaysersburg, a town near Colmar in Alsace, at which latter place we are informed he made his first studies. Of his early life we have practically no details, but we do know that at one time he was a Capuchin, and upon the dispersion of that order by the Revolution in France he fled to Fribourg in Switzerland, where he was ordained in 1796. Immediately after this he joined the Society of the Fathers of the Sacred Heart, which was founded in 1794 by Tournely and de Broglie, and was composed chiefly of those who had been religious of the Society of Jesus, or pupils of the Jesuits before the suppression in 1773. He made his noviceship at Gogingen, distinguished himself for his heroic labors during a plague at Hagenbrunn in Austria, and, being later sent into Italy, spent two years in tireless activity at the military hospital at Pavia. In 1801, he was director of the Ecclesiastical Seminary at Dillingen, and later Rector of a college at Berlin and founder of one

at Amsterdam. Here he came in contact with Fr. Adam Beckers S.J., who had just been received back into the Order by the General in Russia, and through this good man he made his own application for entrance into the Society. It was a time when the scattered Jesuits were timidly and tentatively beginning to take up the threads of the old life. The canonical existence of the Jesuits in Russia was becoming every day more manifest, and many old members were asking for readmittance. Father Kohlmann was to wait almost two years for a favorable answer and he spent the time of waiting at Kensington College, London, under Father Rozaven. At length he got word to come to Russia, and leaving England in June, 1805, arrived at Riga the 10–22 of the same month, and on June 21–July 3 was formally received as a novice at Düneburg. Here he made a year of noviceship and at the end of that time evidently more than satisfied his superiors of his fitness; for, before taking his vows he was ordered to America to teach philosophy at Georgetown.[1]

In the United States at this time the Society was just beginning to take up its revived existence. The General in Russia, where it had never been disestablished, had in a brief of July 2, 1802, received permission to accept subjects in foreign lands. Accordingly, on April 25, 1803, a petition for readmittance was addressed to Bishop Carroll by sixteen men—ex-Jesuits, secular priests and student aspirants—and forwarded by the Bishop to Russia a month later. The result was that Bishop Carroll was empowered to name a Superior, which he did on June 27, 1805, in the person of Fr. Robert Molyneux. A year later the novitiate was opened at Georgetown, with ten novices and Fr. Francis Neale as Novice Master. Kohlmann, who had sailed from Hamburg on August 20, with one companion, Fr. Epinette, arrived at Baltimore on November 4, and it is a proof of the confidence he inspired that he was immediately sent to Georgetown and, while still a novice himself, made socius to the master of novices, whose duties he was soon called upon largely to take over. "With great fervor and unction," says Father McElroy in his *Recollections*, "he gave the novices frequent exhortations, which pro-

[1] These details are taken from GUIDÉE, *Notices Historiques sur quelques membres de la Société des Pères du Sacré Coeur.* Paris, 1860.

duced the most happy effects; he also introduced the customs, penances, etc., usual in the Society as he had found them in Russia."[2]

At Georgetown he remained nearly two years, two very busy years, for, besides his regular duties, he appears in the Catalogue of 1807 as missionary at Alexandria, and we know from his own letters that he was sent out on short trips through Pennsylvania, rounding up the many scattered German Catholics there, and hearing confessions in English at the German Church of the Holy Trinity in Philadelphia, as Fr. Adam Britt, S.J., the pastor there, never fully mastered that language. Father Kohlmann's stay in England had evidently taught him that tongue; he had already in 1807 preached several times in English, he says, "and every one tells me I was fully understood." He is very enthusiastic about the good he was able to do, and says numbers of conversions were made by himself and others. On one of these journeys, in April, 1807, he started by giving a mission at Holy Trinity, Philadelphia, where he stayed two weeks, and then went on to Haycock, Goshenhoppen, Lancaster, Coleman's Furnace Elizabethtown, Little York and Conewago, where the Jesuits had missions, and ended with a triduum at the German Church in Baltimore. In his letters he is continually dwelling on the good to be done. "Conversions are of daily occurrence," he says, and he has the highest hopes for the future of the Church in America. "There is a great number, especially among the Methodists in the country districts, the greater part of whom would, as experience demonstrates, become Catholics, if there was anyone to point out the truth to them."[3]

But it was the eve of great happenings in America, fraught with immense consequences for the Church, and destined to bring about one of the most interesting periods in Father Kohlmann's own life. To appreciate his own place in these happenings, it is necessary to observe closely the exact sequence of events. Bishop Carroll had for some time been petitioning Rome for a division of his vast diocese, and the beginning of 1808 saw

[2] Carroll to Molyneux, June 27, 1805; Kohlmann to Strickland, February 23, 1807; Carroll to Plowden, January 10, 1808; cf. McElroy, *Unpublished Recollections*. (Privately printed.)

[3] Kohlmann to Strickland, February 23, 1807, and March 9, 1808.

the step about to be accomplished. Bishop Concanen, O.P., the newly-elect for New York, was consecrated on April 24, and hastened to convey the good news to America. It finally came through Archbishop Troy of Dublin, on September 25 of the same year.[4] Shortly before this, however, as Carroll says in a letter of September 25, 1809, he had sent to New York, with the approval of their Superiors, Fathers Kohlmann and Benedict Fenwick, and they took with them four scholastics, with the intention of beginning a College there. Father Kohlmann succeeded, as Rector of St. Peter's, the Rev. Matthew Byrne, who had long been desirous of resigning, so that he, too, could enter the Society. He did enter and died as a novice at St. Thomas' Manor, September 28, 1809.[5]

Father Kohlmann came to New York with the most enthusiastic hopes for the Church and his Society. He foresaw that New York would always be the first city in America, and he is all for urging his superiors to forestall events and establish the Society formally there. He was an enthusiastic Jesuit and in the existing state of things could not help being impressed with the preponderating place of his Order in the States. We can forgive him if he did not appreciate the full hierarchical development later years were to bring, and if in private letters he indulged in glowing hopes for the Society.[6] Beyond all doubt he was a sincere and generous hearted man, solely desirous of spreading Christ's religion, wherever he might be. He was well received at St. Peter's, the trustees laying out $800 for the repair of the house, though, he says, before his arrival they had not spent one cent on it. What he took in his humility as a token of regard for his Order, may perhaps also be ascribed to the genial tact and magnetism of the man himself. He had two tasks before him: to tend to his congregation—and, after his appointment as Vicar General, to organize the diocese—to secure the education of youth, his chief purpose in coming, and a prime object of the Society itself. He lost no time in setting about both. On October 11, Bishop Carroll had received word from Bishop Con-

[4] *Cath. Hist. Review*, Vol. ii, p. 27.

[5] McElroy, *ut supra*.

[6] Cf. Kohlmann to Strickland, November 7, 1808; September 14, 1810; November 28, 1810.

canen to appoint someone as Vicar General "with all the necessary powers that you and I can delegate to him."[7] As Father Kohlmann was already on the scene and perfect confidence was had in his ability and prudence, he received the appointment and found himself at the head of a large diocese that took in New York State and the northern end of New Jersey. He does not seem, however, to have received any power to administer confirmation, as Father Nerinckx had, for we find Cheverus of Boston performing that office as late as 1814. Bayley testifies to seeing his name as Vicar General on documents in Quebec [8] and he actually did appoint Bishop Plessis his Vicar for subjects of the diocese near the border, being in turn made the same by that prelate for a like purpose.[9]

In a letter written that November he gives some idea of the work that lay before him.[10] "The congregation chiefly consists of Irish, some hundreds of French and as many Germans, in all, according to the common estimation, of 14,000 souls." "The parish," he later said, "was so neglected in every respect, that it goes beyond all conception."[11] He saw immediately that one church was not sufficient, and with characteristic energy set about building another, large and splendid enough to be the Cathedral of his Bishop, who was in Italy anxiously awaiting a chance to cross the ocean, a chance denied by Napoleon's officials. Accordingly Kohlmann bought a large tract of unoccupied land on Canal Street between Broadway and the Bowery, and with the cooperation of his trustees, but not without pessimistic prophecies from many people, carried it through to completion. It was to be for those Catholics who had settled "outside the city," and was in the country amid the villas of the rich and the scattered farmhouses thereabouts. Woodlands and meadows surrounded it, and "so very close to the wilderness [was it] that foxes were frequent visitors." The pro-

[7] Concanen to Carroll, July 26, 1808, in *Cath. Hist. Review*, Vol. ii, p. 32.

[8] Kohlmann to Strickland, November 7, 1808.

[9] On the canonical aspect of this office, and the objections of the General, S.J., to his holding it, and of Carroll to his giving it up, cf. HUGHES, S.J., *Hist. of S.J. in N. A.*, Documents, pp. 865 *note*, and 857.

[10] Kohlmann to Strickland, November 28, 1808.

[11] DE COURCY, p. 366.

ject succeeded so well that on June 8 of the following year Kohlmann laid the cornerstone. According to a current account, "The Rector, with the assistant clergy, choir and the board of trustees, walked in solemn procession to the ground, where was delivered a suitable discourse, . . . and the ceremonies were concluded amidst a large and respectable assemblage of citizens, exceeding 3,000."[12]

Meanwhile the Fathers were not neglecting any means to raise the spiritual condition of their flock. On December 29, 1808, Kohlmann wrote to the Archbishop: "The whole day, from early in the morning till the evening, is occupied, either in hearing confessions till eleven o'clock, or calls for the sick, superintendence over the common schools, instructions, collecting money for the sick or for the embellishing of the church, etc." His unselfish exertions did not go unrewarded, for shortly afterwards he was able to record: "The communion rail daily filled, though deserted before; general confessions every day . . . three sermons, in English, French and German, every Sunday, instead of the single one in English; three catechism classes every Sunday, instead of one; Protestants every day instructed and received into the Church; sick persons attended with cheerfulness at the first call, and ordinarily such as stand in need of general confession and instruction; application made at all houses to raise a subscription for the poor, by which means $3,000 have been collected, to be paid constantly every year." This generosity of the Catholic faithful shows itself early in a people who, since that time, though never wealthy, have so magnificently given money to forward the glory of God and the welfare of his poor. That Kohlmann's influence and work were predominantly in the spiritual order, and resulted in a universal renewal of piety, is proved by two letters of Bishop Carroll, wherein he was able to say: "Incalculable good is done there," and again on September 19, 1809, "They have already produced most happy fruits by introducing exercises of piety, sodalities, establishing an extensive Academy."[13]

[12] BAYLEY, *Hist. of Cath. Church in N. Y.*, p. 73; FARLEY, *Hist. of St. Patrick's Cathedral*, pp. 49-50. New York, 1908.

[13] Carroll to ————(?), September 5, 1809; to Plowden, England, September 19, 1809.

This Academy was not the first the Jesuits had opened in New York. As far back as 1685, Colonel Dongan, Catholic Governor of the Province, had sent to Europe for some English Jesuits to convert the Iroquois to Christianity, since he was opposed, on national grounds, to using the zealous French missionaries for that purpose. These fathers are mentioned in the Roman catalogue as residing in New York at this time; they are probably those who responded to the Governor's call—Fathers Thomas Harvey, Henry Harrison and Charles Gage. Being unacquainted with the Iroquois dialects, they proceeded no farther than New York, but profited by their stay in that city to open a college, which was called the New York Latin School and was situated upon what are now the grounds of Trinity Church. Their stay was brief and all but fruitless, owing to the small number of Catholics and the untiring bigotry of Leisler, the usurping Protestant Lieutenant Governor of New York.[14] Father Kohlmann started under more favorable circumstances. He began by renting a house in Mulberry Street fronting the ground on which he was building the Cathedral, and here, with the help of his four scholastics, he opened up his school. One of the professors was James Wallace, S.J., reputed the best astronomer of his day in this country, who later became famous by winning the prize offered by the French Government for solving a mathematical problem offered in open competition. Mr. White, S.J., was professor of Latin and Greek. When Kohlmann wrote to the Archbishop after the Christmas of 1808, he already had seventeen pupils. The school soon showed signs of outgrowing its quarters, as in the following July the pastor wrote: "It now consists of about thirty-five of the most respectable children of the city, Catholic as well as Protestant. Four are boarding at our house, and in all probability we shall have seven or eight boarders next August."[15] That September, however, he moved it around to Broadway, and in March, 1810, a new site was secured "far out into the country," on which was a building, to which additions were made. The land was bought in three lots by his two friends, Andrew Morris and Cornelius Heeney, for the sum

[14] O'Callaghan, *Documentary Hist. of New York State*, Vol. ii, p. 14. Shea, *Catholic Churches of New York City*, p. 25.

[15] De Courcy, p. 367.

of $11,000, and they kept the title to it in their own hands.[16] This site, the "most healthy and delightful spot of the whole island," and from which both rivers could be seen, was just opposite the old Elgin Botanic Garden,[17] at what is now Fifth Avenue and Fiftieth Street, the location of the present St. Patrick's Cathedral.

In its new country situation it began really to have the success hoped for by its founder. He continued to direct his two parishes from his house on Mulberry Street, and made Father Fenwick head of the College, while he came out once a week to hear confessions and to attend to other affairs. Father Fenwick was of an old Maryland family, descended from Cuthbert Fenwick, and later was Administrator of Charleston and Bishop of Boston. No means was neglected to enhance the reputation of the school, as for instance the public examination held in September, 1810, which was advertised in the papers and drew a "respectable audience of ladies and gentlemen." Friendly relations were established with Columbia College, and they were invited to the latter's annual commencement in that same year.[18] Among the students of the school was a son of the late Governor Livingston, and one of Governor Tompkins, later Vice-President of the United States. In the first eight months it received thirty-six pupils and later the attendance rose to nearly one hundred.

This same year, 1810, word came to New York of the death of its good Bishop, whom his subjects had never seen. Not in good health when he was named, his constant worries and disappointments wore him out, and just in sight of embarking for America, he was again turned back by Napoleon's agents, and died, one might almost say of a broken heart, at Naples, Italy, on June 19, 1810, a pathetic picture of unfulfilled longings and deferred hopes.[19] To the end he showed the most lively interest in the welfare of his diocese, and his memory was fittingly celebrated by Father Kohlmann in a solemn High Mass at St. Peter's. The

---

[16] HUGHES, *Documents*, p. 357: Marshall, S.J., to the General, S.J., March 5, 1821.

[17] *Historical Records and Studies*, Vol. iv, p. 332 ff.

[18] Kohlmann to Strickland, September 14 and November 28, 1810.

[19] *Cath. Hist. Review*, Vol. ii, p. 43.

trustees, he tells us,[20] spared no expense on the occasion and the church was imposingly decorated. Father Fenwick preached the funeral sermon on the episcopal dignity "to an audience so numerous as has scarce ever been seen before in any church. . . . I am informed that no solemnity performed in our church made ever so blessed an impression on those who were present." Efforts were made to induce Kohlmann to accept the mitre as his successor, but the humble religious always refused.[21]

A striking incident in which Kohlmann figured was his presence at the deathbed of the atheist Tom Paine, in 1809. In a vivid account left by Father Fenwick,[22] who accompanied him, we are told that the wretched man had called for a priest, but only, as they were to discover, because he imagined they could work some good for his body. Fenwick says they agreed beforehand as to what line to take with him, but when he found out the real reason for their visit, the salvation of his soul, his rage was so great that he carried on like a man really possessed. Threats and appeals alternately did no good, and in the midst of the most awful blasphemies, they were compelled to leave him to the mercy of God.

A much more successful effort was his action in the famous confession trial in New York in 1813. A Catholic named James Keating had accused a certain Philipps and his wife of receiving goods stolen from himself, and later, suspicion of the theft fell upon two negroes. Before the trial came off, however, Keating announced he had recovered his goods and, upon being questioned, replied that restitution had been made through Father Kohlmann. The latter, thereupon, was subpoenaed to give his witness, but respectfully refused to give the name of the culprit, as he had the knowledge only under the seal of confession. The trial came off, however, this time at the request of St. Peter's trustees, so that the point might be determined. It aroused immense interest, and again Father Kohlmann refused to give witness. Two Protestants, Messrs. Riker and Sampson, had volunteered to be his counsel, and they argued his case with great ability. The judges were De Witt Clinton, the mayor;

[20] Kohlmann to Carroll, October 12, 1810.
[21] *Catholic Almanac*, 1856, p. 49.
[22] *U. S. Cath. Mag.*, Vol. v, p. 558.

Josiah Ogden Hoffmann, recorder, and Richard Cunningham and Isaac Douglass as aldermen. The mayor gave the decision. It was a lengthy and full statement of the case for religious liberty and on these grounds and those of the rules for evidence, excused Kohlmann from giving witness where his religion forbade it, and where he would be exposed to infamy, and, in his own conviction, to punishment in a future state. As Bayley remarks, things had come a long way from the bigotry and prejudice of pre-Revolution days.[23] The case had a twofold outcome. One was a law passed in Albany, December 10, 1828, ensuring ministers and priests freedom from disclosing matters known only in a professional capacity, when such silence is imposed by their denomination. The other was a book by Father Kohlmann himself, in which he took advantage of the intense interest aroused, to enlighten non-Catholics on the matter in question, and state convincingly the Church's doctrine on the Sacrament of Penance. It appeared as an appendix to a review of the whole case by William Sampson, Esq., called "The Catholic Question in America."[24] It is a complete theological treatise on the sacrament, and is in high regard for its clearness and completeness.

In a letter written in 1810,[25] Kohlmann had stated his plans for the advancement of religion in the Diocese—a school for boys, a convent for girls, and an orphan home conducted by nuns. The first he had already established, and for the second he secured through Father Betagh, S.J., of Dublin, a few Ursulines, who came in April, 1812, and settled on Fiftieth Street near Third Avenue. But since they came only on condition of receiving novices within three years, at the end of that time they returned to Ireland.[26] Their chaplains during that period were the Trappist Fathers, who, driven by persecution from France, had finally come to New York. A community of Trappist nuns also came with them, and fulfilled for a time Kohlmann's third requirement. At one time they had thirty-one children under their care. In October, 1814, however, all monks and sisters embarked for Havre, as it seems the superior, Dom Augustine,

[23] Bayley, *op. cit.*, p. 82.
[24] Printed in New York, by Edward Gillespy, 1813.
[25] Kohlmann to Strickland, November 28, 1810.
[26] De Courcy, pp. 377–380; Bayley, p. 82*ff*.

had never really given up the intention of finally resettling in France.

In 1814 Kohlmann's stay in New York was drawing to a close. That it was a fruitful one we cannot doubt. The new Cathedral due to him was completed, but was only consecrated after he left, on May 14, 1815. Prejudice and bigotry had been allayed, and the Catholic religion was more favorably known to outsiders, while the spiritual level of the flock itself was perceptibly raised, and he had won high praise from Bishops Carroll and Cheverus.[27] But one by one the high hopes with which he had come to New York seem to have vanished. The Cathedral was long in building; though three more priests, among them his own brother Paul, had joined him in 1812, the school seemed destined to fail through lack of teachers of the Society; no bishop had come to take over the administration of the vast diocese, and the Society itself was in an anomalous position. It was not until its world-wide restoration on August 7, 1814, that the American Jesuits were able to show to Bishop Carroll the proofs of that complete independent canonical existence that he demanded. The delay greatly hampered their expansion, and if they were to exist at all, it became increasingly evident that they must adopt a cautious policy, or take on a factitious extension outside their rules which Carroll agreed with them they were prudent not to do.[28] Father John Grassi, the Superior, writing to Kohlmann, told him that Maréchal, who, it was supposed, was to be the next Bishop, agreed that the New York School was become an *onus insupportabile*, and in this Carroll, while praising what Kohlmann had done, concurred.[29] Accordingly, after further consultation with his own advisers, he recalled the teachers to help build up what could be made certain and safe, the College at Georgetown. This was in September, 1813, and the building on Fifth Avenue was loaned to the Trappists, leaving on it, with the Jesuits, a debt of honor of $10,000, which they paid with difficulty later. It had an interesting subsequent history told in

---

[27] Cheverus, Boston, to Plessis, Quebec, January 20, 1811.

[28] Carroll to Plowden, England, December 12, 1813.

[29] De Courcy, pp. 368-9; Carroll, in note 28. Grassi, writing in 1818, says it was closed "solely for want of teachers," *Notizie Varie sullo Stato della Repubblica degli Stati Uniti*, Milan, 1819.

Cardinal Farley's *History of St. Patrick's Cathedral.* It was sold by the Jesuits on February 27, 1821, for $1,800.[30]

The uncertain state of affairs as to New York and the problematic good he might still do there, influenced the recall of Father Kohlmann himself to important work in Maryland. The second phase of his life in America was over and the third began. He left New York in January, 1815, and was immediately made Master of Novices at White Marsh. The externally uneventful life he led here was soon rudely broken by the death of the venerable Archbishop on December 3, 1815. Both he and Grassi were present at that saintly deathbed. Almost the good prelate's last words, as reported by Grassi,[31] were: "There is one thing more than any other gives me consolation at this moment, and that is that I have placed my Archdiocese under the protection of the Blessed Virgin Mary." In the summer of 1817 Grassi went to Rome, and never returned. His natural successor was Kohlmann, and his appointment dates from September 10, 1817. He immediately removed to Georgetown, taking also the post of Rector of that College. The Luther Tercentenary was being celebrated about this time, and Kohlmann entered the lists with two important pamphlets on the heresiarch, the second a species of dialogue with a Lutheran pastor of Pennsylvania, wherein he refutes all modern pretensions in Luther's own words, quoting book and page.[32] A little later a new project was under way in Washington. A building erected for a novitiate on F Street near 10th, was made instead a theologate, and on August 15, 1820, Kohlmann moved in as Rector and Professor of Dogma, with Fr. Maximilian Rantzau as Professor of Moral, and eight theologians. Some prominent Catholics were soon attracted by the institution, and begged Kohlmann to open its halls to the boys of the city. This was done, and on September 1, 1821, it was started as a day-school. "Directed by the ability and experi-

---

[30] HUGHES, *Documents*, pp. 357, 897. It was Marshall who, as procurator of the mission, sold the property. Marshall to General, S.J., March 5, 1821.

[31] MCELROY, *Recollections.*

[32] "*The Lutheran Centurial Jubilee*" and "*The Blessed Reformation, Martin Luther portrayed by himself, etc.,*" Philadelphia, Bernard Dornin, 1818. 94 pp. Finotti, p. 185, says that the author's name "John Beschter" is a pseudonym for Kohlmann.

ence of Father Kohlmann, Gonzaga College [as it was later known] soon became the leading school in Washington." The classes—three that year, nine the next—were taught by the theologians. It was while here that he met Mrs. Ann Mattingly,[33] sister of Thomas Carbery, Mayor of Washington, and persuaded her to make the novena in union with the prayers of Prince Hohenlohe, that resulted on March 10, 1824, in her complete restoration to health. Here, too, he wrote and published his famous treatise on Unitarianism.[34] Jared Sparks, then of the Unitarian Church in Baltimore, in an effort to transplant his doctrines from New England to that city, was editing *The Unitarian Miscellany*, and to offset the effect of this Kohlmann launched a series of pamphlets, thirteen in number, in which he attacks that system with a wealth of patristic and scriptural learning, brilliant theological reasoning, and many moral and psychological arguments, calculated to persuade as well as to convince, and at the same time treats his adversary with uniform courtesy, patience and firmness. It had a real success, and by 1822 the third edition in book form had appeared. Father McElroy is authority for saying that for years the book was read in the refectory of St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore.

This book was probably indirectly the cause for his leaving America. Pope Leo XII, on May 17, 1824, restored to the Jesuits the Roman College, which they had lost at the Suppression, and eminent theologians were called in from all parts of the world to make this college once more a great seat of learning and one of service to the entire world. Father Kohlmann was one of these, and for five years he taught dogma there, associating with such men as Taparelli, Perrone and Patrizi, and having for pupils the future Leo XIII and the future Cardinal Cullen. It was while objecting at a public defense by the latter that he attracted the attention of the Pope, who soon made him a consultor of the Congregations of Ecclesiastical Affairs and of Bishops and Regulars. Later on, by Gregory XVI, he was made Qualificator of the Inquisition, and the same Pope is said to have

[33] *U. S. Cath. Miscellany*, Charleston, 1824, pp. 351, 361, 375, 387, 403; a fully documented account of the miracle.

[34] *Unitarianism, Philosophically and Theologically Examined*, Washington City, Henry Guegan, 1821, two volumes, pp. 296 and 265.

wished to make him a Cardinal. In 1830, he retired from his office and became spiritual father at the Roman College, and the next year retired to the professed house of the Gesù, where he was destined to end his days, and where, in addition to his work on the Congregations, he gave himself up freely to the confessional and the apostolate. He enjoyed a high reputation as a spiritual director, his wide knowledge of languages undoubtedly attracting to him many young men from many lands, among whom was Father John McCloskey, the future Cardinal.[35] He always enjoyed also a peculiar ascendancy over the minds of those outside the Church, and one conversion of this period that caused a sensation was that of Augustine Theiner, the historian, who has himself graphically related the event in the preface of one of his works.[36] A first visit reluctantly made completely won him over, and after a few more he was entirely satisfied, and returned, after many wanderings, to the Church, on April 3, 1833. Among his own brethren, Father Kohlmann's last years were the cause of much edification, the fruit of a holy life well spent in single hearted labor for religion wherever obedience called him—a typical apostle of those days, learned and indefatigable, with much personal charm that won him many victories, and, besides, a decided gift for government. It was the labor of his last Lent that killed him. Though already stricken with inflammation of the lungs, he persisted in the confessional on April 8, 1836, for several hours.[37] Two days later, in the most pious Christian sentiments of resignation he breathed his last.[38]

J. Wilfrid Parsons, S.J.,
Woodstock College, Maryland.

[35] McCloskey, Rome, to Dr. Power, V.G., New York, April 15, 1836; *Hist. Rec. and Studies*, Vol. ii, p. 278.

[36] *Histoire des Institutions d'Education Ecclésiastique*, i, Introd.

[37] *Catholic Almanac*, 1872, p. 80.

[38] For Cardinal McCloskey's account of the death of Father Kohlman, cf., Cardinal Farley, *Life of John Cardinal McCloskey*, pp. 110–112. New York, 1918.

A CENTENNIAL OF THE CHURCH IN ST. LOUIS (1818-1918)

The Fifth of January, 1918, brought to the city of St. Louis the centenary of the coming and installation of Bishop Du Bourg. It marked also the hundredth anniversary of the establishment there of a permanent clergy.[1] The date is of more than mere local interest, for the double event just mentioned may be truly said to have inaugurated a new era in the history of the Church in the immense territory west of the Mississippi River.

In the beginning of 1818, St. Louis was only a little town of some two thousand inhabitants,[2] and could scarcely be regarded a religious center in the Louisiana Diocese, as most of the Catholics were in the South; moreover, New Orleans, the logical cathedral city, had been an Episcopal See in Spanish times, and the residence of Du Bourg himself during the years of his Administratorship (1812–1815). What motives, therefore, led the Bishop of Louisiana to settle in that out-of-the-way place?

The investigation of these motives, the account of the various steps which culminated in the Prelate's decision, and the recital of the circumstances attending his actual installation in St. Louis, is the object of this paper.

Appointed Administrator-apostolic of Louisiana by Archbishop Carroll on August 18, 1812, Father Louis William Du Bourg had worked strenuously, for well-nigh three years, to bring order into the vast Diocese committed to his charge. His

---

[1] Bishop Spalding, in his *Sketches of the Life, Times and Character of Bishop Flaget*, p. 186, gives the list of all the priests "who held pastoral charge of St. Louis from its foundation;" and in this list we find the indication: "1811–1817, Rev. F. Savine." Father Savine was then pastor of Cahokia, and attended St. Louis as an out-mission, the third Sunday of every month. Rev. Joseph Rosati's name follows that of Father Savine for the year 1817. Father Rosati came to St. Louis on October 17, 1817, with Bishop Flaget and Father De Andreis for the purpose of making preparations in view of the reception of Bishop Du Bourg, and stayed there about a week. The parish register mentions only four baptisms performed by him during that time, he never held pastoral charge in St. Louis.

[2] Recollections of John F. Darby in Walter B. Stevens' *St. Louis the Fourth City*, 1764–1909, Vol. i, p. 117. St. Louis, 1909. Two-thirds of the population were French and one-third Americans. There may have been four to five hundred negroes, but these were not, it appears, registered in the census. The prevailing language of the white people was French; all the colored people spoke French.

was almost a superhuman task. To begin with, his jurisdiction extended not only over the whole of the Louisiana Purchase, but over the Floridas as well. The immense territory, known as Upper Louisiana, was then but sparsely populated and gave little trouble to the ecclesiastical authorities; moreover, the Bishop of Bardstown had consented to look after its spiritual welfare. But the Floridas were an apple of discord between the Administrator and the Bishop of Havana. At the time of the erection of the See of New Orleans (1793), when Louisiana was a Spanish possession, the Floridas, which were likewise a dependency of the crown of Spain, had been annexed to the new Diocese. But after the retrocession of Louisiana to France, and its sale by Bonaparte to the United States, the Bishop of Havana, on the plea that Spanish lands ought to be ruled by Spanish Bishops, pretended that Florida had reverted to his Diocese. Archbishop Carroll and Father Du Bourg, on the other hand, challenged this claim; and even though Rome upheld their view, it was no easy matter to persuade the tenacious Cuban prelate to relinquish his title.

These, however, were trifling difficulties compared to the troubles which the Administrator had to contend with at home, in Lower Louisiana. In that portion of the Diocese, which numbered more than 50,000 Catholics,[3] there were only eleven parishes,[4] and not enough priests to attend them all. It is not strange, therefore, that, "many Catholics die without sacraments, many children unbaptized; others scarce see a priest once in a lifetime; marriages are contracted without blessing, Christian doctrine is not taught, and such a decay of Christian life is to be observed, that within a few years the Catholic faith will be entirely obliterated."[5] Darker still is the picture of the conditions in New Orleans: "There is rife in that city a spirit of unbelief, or rather of godlessness, which is gradually corrupting the whole

[3] A note in the Archives of Propaganda: *Scritture referite nei Congressi. America Centrale. Codice 4. Notizia de Luigiana*, gives the total number of Catholics in the whole Diocese as 150,000, certainly too high a figure; the estimate of Bishop Du Bourg (60,000) is, no doubt, much nearer the truth.

[4] New Orleans, Terre-aux-Boeufs, St. Charles, St. John Baptist, St. James, Ascension, St. Gabriel, Pointe-Coupée, St. Martin, Natchitoches and Natchez.

[5] *Notizia.*

mass. This plague is to be attributed to the coming of a great number of free-masons and hucksters of every description, to the spread of French maxims, to infrequent preaching of the word of God, to love of lucre and pleasure, so much intensified by the climate and the number of female slaves, above all to the scandals given by the clergy."[6]

These last words, however, ought not to be understood as applying to the entire clergy. Of the five priests then living in New Orleans, three are singled out, birds of a feather whom analogous instincts moved to flock together and who made the cathedral their eyrie: the Spanish Capuchin Rector, Anthony de Sedella—Père Antoine, as he was commonly called—for years the head of a clique opposed to the new order of things created by the Louisiana Purchase, and his two notorious assistants, the whilom Recollect John Kuana (Kuhn?) and the ex-Dominican Père Thomas.

And to make things yet worse, at the gates of the city stood an English army ready to attack it.

Amidst such trying circumstances, Father Du Bourg had met with partial success. His attitude during the crucial moments of the war had won him the respect of the saner part of the people and that of public officials, General Jackson in particular; at the same time, the opposition had somewhat abated, at least momentarily, when the ringleader, Father Anthony, yielded a kind of recognition to the Administrator's authority. But all this did not compensate the havoc wrought by death among the clergy: "They die like flies," wrote Du Bourg to Bishop Flaget. In the eighteen months since his arrival,[7] four priests of the Diocese had passed away, so that ten only remained, *tant bons, indifférents, que mauvais*—two over sixty, and three above seventy years of age.

The treaty of Ghent (December 24, 1814) and the crushing defeat of General Packenham at New Orleans having now cleared the ocean of hostile vessels, Father Du Bourg resolved to go directly to lay before the Pope the pressing needs of the flock entrusted to his care. "Were it necessary," he said to

---

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] The letter containing these details is dated December, 1814.

Bishop Flaget, "I would go to China, either to be relieved of this terrible burden, or to seek necessary aid to enable me to bear it properly." He would make an earnest appeal for evangelical laborers, and, if unsuccessful, would request the Holy Father to accept his resignation. At any rate, he would provide for Upper Louisiana by asking its dismemberment from New Orleans and its union to the See of Bardstown.

The news of his approaching departure at once rekindled the fire of the smouldering opposition; and a spirited correspondence on the lawfulness of the appointment of Father Louis Sibourd as Vicar General was exchanged between the Cathedral and the Ursuline Convent where Father Du Bourg made his residence. The Administrator had announced to Father Anthony the Vicar General's appointment in the following note:[8]

New Orleans, April 29, 1815.

Reverend Father:

Being about to start for Europe, whereto the urgent needs of the Diocese entrusted to my care compel me to go, I have the honor to notify you that I have appointed the Rev. Louis Sibourd my Vicar General, to administer the Diocese during my absence, and that, accordingly, he is the person to whom all things within the pale of Ecclesiastical authority should be referred. I have in regard of this appointment all the necessary faculties.

I am respectfully,
Reverend Father,
Your servant
WM. DU BOURG.

Two days later, Father de Sedella replied to the Administrator:

New Orleans, May 1, 1815.

Reverend Administrator Apostolic:

In order to enable me to answer with proper accuracy your favor of the 29th ult., received yesterday, I beg you kindly to show me your letter of appointment as Administrator Apostolic, and the new faculties received by you subsequently which empower you to appoint a Vicar General for the time of your absence; otherwise neither my honor nor my ministry allow me to comply with your ordinance.

Moreover, you are certainly aware that all title-letters and like faculties should be entered and preserved in the Archives of this church, in order that they might be authenticated by this formality—which has not been done hitherto.

I beg, etc., P. ANTHONY DE SEDELLA, *Rector.*

[8] *Arch. of Prop., l. c.*, Cod. 3. *ff.* 330.

Without delay, Father Du Bourg penned the following reply:

Reverend Father:

Being desirous not to leave the least shadow of difficulty remain over the faculty by virtue of which I have appointed the Rev. Louis Sibourd Vicar General to take my place pending the indispensable journey which I am about to make to Europe in the interest of the Diocese, I am sending you a copy of my letter of appointment certified and registered at the office of Mr. Narcisse Brontio, Notary Public.[9] You will notice, Reverend

[9] Although the text of the Pontifical Brief to Bishop Carroll and that of Bishop Carroll's letter to Father Du Bourg are well known, it may not be out of place to give them here.

To our Venerable Brother the Archbishop of Baltimore, PIUS VII, POPE.

Venerable Brother, Health and the Apostolic Blessing.

The solicitude wherewith the Roman Pontiff must look after the whole church of God cannot allow any part of the vineyard planted by the eternal Son of the Father to be without labourers, in order that by their work and unremitting zeal the true faith, which is one as God himself is One, should be firmly maintained and spread ever farther, and the spiritual harvest of souls increased to the hundredfold. Some time ago, We provided for the Church of New Orleans, that is, of Louisiana, in North America, bereft of its Pastor and Bishop, by committing that Church to your Ordinary jurisdiction, dear Brother, until We and this Holy See may find an opportunity to make some more satisfactory arrangement. As this opportunity is not yet forthcoming, and you have enough other heavy burdens to care for, We, therefore, pursuant to the advice of our Venerable Brethren the Cardinals of the Congregation of Propaganda, in order that nothing demanded by the spiritual necessity or interest of the faithful residing in those parts should be left undone, instruct and enjoin you, Venerable Brother, if before the Lord you deem this measure expedient, to delegate and send by our Apostolic authority to the aforesaid State of Louisiana, in the capacity of Administrator Apostolic and with the rights of an Ordinary, for as long a space of time as shall be this Holy See's pleasure, and according to the instruction which shall be forwarded you by the above-mentioned Congregation, either our Beloved Son, Charles Nerinckx, in whose zeal and virtue We have absolute confidence, or, if perchance he should deem himself unequal to the task, another capable priest, well known by you, secular or regular;—all things to the contrary notwithstanding.

Given at Rome, at St. Mary Major, under the seal of the Fisherman, April 6, 1808. L. Card. ANTONELLI.

Very Rev. William Du Bourg,

President of St. Mary's College, Baltimore.

I, the undersigned, Archbishop of Baltimore, fully cognizant of your faith, the sterling quality of your conduct and doctrine, your tireless zeal for the care of souls, and your masterful preaching of the word of God, by virtue of the above Pontifical Brief, delegate and send you, Very Rev. Wm. Du Bourg, to the Diocese of New Orleans, that is, of the State of Louisiana, in order that you may, by Apostolic authority, rule this same Diocese in the capacity of Administrator Apostolic, and with the rights of an Ordinary, for as long a space of time as shall be the Sovereign Pontiff's and Holy See's good pleasure. In the Name of the Most Holy Trinity, One God, Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Amen.

Given at Baltimore under our Great Seal, on August 18, 1812.

✠John, *Archbishop of Baltimore.*

Father, that in this letter the Pope gives to the priest whom the Most Reverend Archbishop of Baltimore may, by virtue of the Pontifical Brief, eventually appoint, the title of Administrator Apostolic of Louisiana, revocable only by the Holy See. I am, therefore, by the choice which this Prelate made of me, the Pope's immediate delegate, and, as such, have received from His Holiness all the rights appertaining to the Ordinary: *cum juribus Ordinarii.*

Now, that such persons as are delegated by the Pope to an office of jurisdiction, have the right to subdelegate the faculties attached to this office, is incontrovertible. So affirms Cabassut in his *Théorie et Pratique du Droit Canonique*, l. iv, c. 1, No. 11: *Delegati a Papa subdelegare possunt quando eis collata fuit potestas per modum jurisdictionis;* and he cites as his authority the *Cap. fin. de Off. et Potest. judic. deleg.*

Conformably to this principle universally admitted by canonists, the Pope, in the general faculties which he sends to all the Prefects of Missions, Vicars Apostolic, etc., closes with these words: *praedictas facultates communicandi sacerdotibus idoneis, ut, sede vacante, sit qui possit supplere donec Sedes Apostolica certior facta alio modo provideat.*

These last words deserve attention. They prove that it is the Church's intention 1° that its jurisdiction be not interrupted anywhere; 2° that this jurisdiction be transmitted, at least provisionally, by him who is in possession thereof. From this it follows that not only the Pope's immediate delegate, but subdelegates themselves have the right to appoint their successors, or substitutes, when they are compelled to discontinue the exercise of their authority, and this until other provision be made by the Sovereign Pontiff.

Thus, by virtue of this power, founded on the very constitution of the Church, the Prefects Apostolic in the Missions have always appointed one or two vice-prefects in their stead. This is a well-known fact.

By itself, the clause *cum juribus Ordinarii* qualifying my office in the Brief of His Holiness, unequivocally says as much. In Ecclesiastical parlance the Ordinary, or the Bishop, are one and the same thing, so far as jurisdiction is concerned. I am, then, in possession of all the jurisdictional rights of the Bishop. Like the Bishop, therefore, I am empowered to communicate my faculties to another; for this power is not a privilege of Order, but a consequence of jurisdiction, as is manifest from the fact that a Bishop-elect, even before his consecration, can appoint a Vicar General.

In point of fact, what am I doing, when I appoint a Pastor, but communicating to him my jurisdiction over a part of the territory assigned to me? Now if I can thus apportion my jurisdiction piecemeal, is it not evident that I can commit to another the whole of it as well?

I trust, Reverend Father, that the above remarks will satisfy you. The Rev. Rectors of the Diocese have already manifested their readiness to acknowledge Father Sibourd as provisional superior during my absence and until the proper authorities appoint some one else. Your refusing

to acknowledge his authority would eventually result in the nullity of all marriages in need of a dispensation from diriment impediments.

I am respectfully,
Reverend Father,
Your most humble and devoted servant
WM. DU BOURG.

New Orleans, May 2, 1815.

The Administrator's lucid Canon Law dissertation elicited this astonishing rejoinder:

Reverend Administrator Apostolic:

As I am by inclination a lover of peace and a punctual observer of the orders of my lawful superiors, as you well know, allow me to state candidly that neither from your special letter of appointment by the Most Rev. Archbishop of Baltimore, nor from the letter sent at the same time by the same Most Rev. Gentleman to Father John Olivier, can anything else be taken, but that you are a mere subdelegate, without any other faculties than those which your predecessor enjoyed. I shall not argue about the title of Administrator Apostolic which occurs in your letter of appointment referred to above; but I do beseech you to be pleased to indicate clearly to me in what letter or Brief you have received from the Holy Father the faculty to appoint a Vicar General for the time of your absence, as you positively assert in your favor of the 29th ult.; since in the aforementioned document there is not a word to that effect. I will add, moreover, that, in order to absent himself from his official residence for a protracted length of time, a person entrusted with a duty such as that which you discharge, must, according to the best canonists, have some great causes concerning the Church at large, and not a particular Church; and in the supposition that such causes be true, it is absolutely necessary, moreover, that beforehand a written permission should be asked from, and granted by the Holy Father, or at least the Metropolitan or the senior Bishop of the Province. In view of the foregoing remarks, I hope that you will do me the kindness to put at rest my conscience and that of others on this point. Were you to act otherwise, you would be answerable for all the evils which might ensue.

Ever your devoted servant,
P. ANTHONY DE SEDELLA.

New Orleans, May 3, 1815.

Was this "bluff" or ignorance on the part of the wily Capuchin? At any rate, Father Du Bourg condescended to answer once more:

New Orleans, May 3, 1815.

Reverend Father:

In reply to yours of this day, just received, I must first express my surprise that you did not advert to the difference between an Adminis-

trator Apostolic and an Administrator's Vicar General. My true predecessor was not Father Olivier, but the Most Rev. Archbishop of Baltimore, for whom I was substituted according to the Brief that I sent you: for it was not as Archbishop of Baltimore that he exercised jurisdiction over this vacant See, but because the Pope had especially entrusted this office to him, as he himself says; and the very words whereby faculty was given to the Archbishop to relieve himself of this burden by confiding it entirely to another person, declare the latter shall be regarded as sent in the name of the Holy See, and enjoy all the rights which were formally the Most Rev. Archbishop's. Now this Prelate unquestionably had the right to appoint a Vicar General; therefore, I also have that right. There you have, as well as from the general faculties granted to Prefects Apostolic in the Missions, which I mentioned in my last letter, the solid foundation upon which was grounded my assertion that I am empowered by the Pope to designate a substitute.

I am perfectly aware, Reverend Father, that an Ecclesiastical superior must have grave reasons to absent himself from his Diocese; but I am aware also of the fact that he is answerable for these reasons only to his superior. As a matter of fact, I have for this journey the assent of the Most Rev. Archbishop; but this was in no way necessary, for every superior has the right to go to Rome, in order to confer with the Head of the Church, and is accountable therefor to no one. Nevertheless, I, too, am too much a lover of peace, not to be disposed to communicate to you the Most Rev. Archbishop's letter on this subject. The letter is in English, but in it is enclosed another in Latin, addressed to His Eminence Card. Litta, Prefect of Propaganda, to whom I am to present it. This letter, and even both of them, I will show you readily, if you take the trouble to come here.

You may withal, Reverend Father, do as you please. I have satisfied my conscience, and am no longer responsible for the ominous consequences which your letter makes me anticipate; but these forebodings cannot deter me from undertaking my intended journey, as the interest of the Diocese, of which I am sole judge, appears to me to demand it.

I am respectfully,

Reverend Father,

Your most humble and devoted servant,

WM. DU BOURG.

P. S.—I beg you to understand that when I say: You may do as you please, my intention is by no means to countenance your departing from the order which, as Ordinary of this Diocese, I deemed it my duty to establish for the exercise of my jurisdiction during my absence. Having no exterior means of compelling the priests to submission, I can only bemoan their behavior before God, and make it known to His Holiness.

WM. DU BOURG.

The next day, May 4, the Administrator, his mind overcast by ill omens of what was but too likely to happen during his absence, sailed for Europe. He landed at Bordeaux at a most unpropitious moment (early in July, 1815), just when, after Napoleon's defeat at Waterloo (June 18) and his abdication (June 22), and the subsequent capitulation of Paris to Blücher (July 3), the whole country was in an uproar. To set out on a journey through distracted France would have been sheer rashness. Father Du Bourg, therefore, decided to wait at Bordeaux until travelling should be safe, and from the Archbishop's palace, where he was tendered the most generous hospitality, wrote to Card. Litta:[10]

Bordeaux, July 12, 1815.

Your Eminence:

From Louisiana, in North America, I set out some time ago to visit the *limina* of the holy Apostles, for the purpose to set forth personally before the Holy See the most wretched condition of this church long since bereft of Pastor, the administration of which was, by Apostolic authority, entrusted to my humble person. I just landed in France, where, owing to civil disturbances and the dangers attending travel, I am prevented, I do not know for how long, to pursue my journey. For this reason I have deemed it necessary to implore without delay Your Eminence's help, in order to obtain that, as soon as possible, by an act of the Apostolic authority provision might be made, at least temporarily, for the ecclesiastical government of that Diocese. Naturally I did not fail, just before my departure, to appoint as Vicar General a man remarkable by his piety and prudence, namely, the Rev. Louis Sibourd, formerly pastor in the French Island of San Domingo; and to him at once the missionaries of the State promised obedience—all but one. This man is the Spanish Capuchin Father Anthony de Sedella, concerning whom my predecessors had in the past grave complaints to make to the Holy Father, and I myself shall have much to say when I have an audience with Your Eminence. This man, impatient of control, and quite expert in the art of tickling the popular fancy, who, for thirty years and more has lorded it in the Cathedral, and holds and twists at will in his hand the minds of nearly all the inhabitants of a large city, this man, I say, challenging my power to delegate my authority, is, now that the first schism kindled by him has been quenched, threatening to start another. Unless treatment is promptly applied to this frightful calamity, the evil, I am afraid, will be soon past remedy.

The Administrator begged for a recognition of the lawfulness

[10] *Arch. of Propag., l.c.*, Cod. 3, Fol. 333.

of Father Sibourd's appointment, pointing out the necessity to abstain, for prudential reasons, from any reference, even indirect, to Father Anthony.

What the result of this petition was, we do not know in every detail; we can say only that the stand taken by the Administrator in this affair was undoubtedly approved: of this approval the fact that no sooner had Du Bourg reached the Eternal City (September, 1815), than he was made Bishop,[11] is sufficient evidence; moreover, a note of the Secretary of Propaganda written on the back of Du Bourg's letter informs us that the Congregation wrote on this subject to Archbishop Carroll on August 26 following.[12] Archbishop Carroll died on December 3, 1815, possibly before this letter reached him;[13] at any rate, it was Archbishop Neale who answered it, on February 4, 1816:[14]

> . . . Four letters sent from Rome . . . one dated August 26, 1815 . . . In this I noticed the commission given to the Archbishop to uphold without delay before the Catholics of Louisiana the authority of the Vicar General, Rev. Louis Sibourd, appointed by the Administrator to rule in his absence, against the attempts of Father Anthony, who claims the right to govern the Church of Louisiana until the Administrator's return.
>
> Now whilst I was considering what means of performing the commission laid upon me might prove the most effectual, I just received from the Rev. Louis Sibourd a letter telling me that Father Anthony has put an end to the trouble of which he was so long the cause, and ceased to exercise the jurisdiction he had usurped; so that there remains for me no necessity to interfere in the quarrel.

How short-lived Father Anthony's submission was, the sequel will manifest.

---

[11] He had been already appointed for the first time in 1812, shortly after being made Administrator, and had accepted the appointment. His Bulls, however, were delayed. Father Maréchal, then in France, wrote that he expected to be the bearer of them; but he returned to Baltimore without them. Pope Pius VII, lingering in prison, and worn out by the intrigues and harassing vexations of his imperial gaoler, firmly declined to issue any more Bulls. SPALDING, *Flaget*, pp. 163-164. A note informs us that all these particulars are gathered from a letter of Du Bourg to Bishop Flaget, dated Baltimore, August 11, 1812.

[12] This letter must be in the Archives of Baltimore.

[13] The matter might be ascertained if the date of receipt was entered on the original, or a Journal of the correspondence sent and received was kept. The point is of secondary importance.

[14] *Arch. of Prop., l.c.*, Cod. 3, Ff. 360-364.

It does not fall within the scope of this paper to rehearse the various events which filled the days of Du Bourg's sojourn in Rome, to tell how, despite his reluctance, he was finally prevailed upon to receive episcopal consecration (September 24, 1815), and how his "refusal to take No for an answer" secured for his Diocese a band of missionaries and substantial pecuniary aid. When his first recruits left Rome (October 21[15] and December 15,[16] 1815) for Bordeaux, the understanding was they were to go with the Bishop to New Orleans. Great was their surprise, therefore, when, whilst waiting at Bordeaux for the prelate, they were informed by a letter written from Lyons on Easter Sunday (April 24), 1816, that the Bishop was abandoning his project of going, and taking them, to Lower Louisiana. This letter, addressed to Father De Andreis,[17] read in part as follows:

> I see you are all eager to sail. Yet, since I saw you last, I had decided our departure would not be before next October; and letters which I received from New Orleans recommend waiting until the above mentioned date, on account of the summer heat and the autumn fevers prevailing there, which would expose too much my precious colony. Nevertheless other more recent letters, which convey very sad news and tell of the darkest machinations of the *inimicus homo* who controls the religious opinions of that city, compel me to alter all my plans, and may bring about your departure at a much earlier date. . . .
>
> You know that when a general wishes to conquer a country, he does not always stop to besiege fortified cities, lest this should weaken his army and hamper at every step the progress of the campaign. According to this mode of strategy, I am considering leaving aside New Orleans, and attacking my Diocese at points more easy of access for me: instead of fixing my residence and my establishments in Lower Louisiana, it is to St. Louis, in Upper Louisiana, that I am thinking to go, at least for a while.
>
> . . . Many reasons convince me that, even apart from the opposition to be met with at New Orleans, the good of the Diocese suggests that St. Louis should have the preference as the Episcopal city. I think I am perfectly free in this regard, since, after all, I shall still be within the Diocese; however, for conscience's sake, I have written to Rome to have the opinion of Propaganda on this matter. Should the Holy See

[15] Fathers Rosati, C.M., Acquaroni, C.M., Spezioli, and Mr. Deys. Father Spezioli went no farther than Bordeaux.

[16] Fathers De Andreis, C.M., Marliani, Messrs. Dahmen and Gonzalez. At Bordeaux Father Marliani was found by the doctors unable to undertake the trip.

[17] Original in the *Archives of St. Louis Archdiocese Chancery*.

refuse to sanction this new plan of mine, I would consider our Mission as a rash undertaking, and the whole affair a wretched failure.

The letter to Rome to which reference is made by Bishop Du Bourg had been sent on 11th of April to Card. Dunagni, Pro-Prefect of Propaganda.[18] After thanking the Cardinal for a gift of 600 *scudi* voted by the Congregation at the Pro-Prefect's instance, and registering the success obtained so far, the Bishop of Louisiana broaches the subject of his intended change of residence:

The news which I received from New Orleans would almost make me give up the whole undertaking. The *inimicus homo*, on hearing of my appointment, renewed and multiplied his perfidious wiles. There is now question of having the State Legislature pass a law placing my temporalities under the absolute control of the men most strenuously opposed to Episcopal authority; and so heated are the minds of the party, that my friends entertain fears about my personal safety, should I appear in the City. Your Eminence may realize easily what distress such news caused me. I must say candidly that I came very near beseeching His Holiness to take away from my shoulders a burden which, in circumstances such as these, appeared to me simply unbearable.

Unbearable it would be, indeed, Your Eminence, for the most courageous and fearless Bishop, if he were obliged to settle in the city of New Orleans, or even in Lower Louisiana, which is almost entirely under the influence of that wretched Religious. Nothing at all can be hoped there as long as that man is living. However, I feel how essential it is not to give up the hope of bringing back some day by dint of meekness that part of the Diocese under submission to Episcopal authority. But this consideration itself positively forbids exposing the Bishop to an uneven struggle, the inevitable result of which can be only the loss of the respect due to his dignity. I see but one means of reconciling all the interests at stake, and I beg Your Eminence kindly to propose this means to the Cardinal Prefect and to the Sacred Congregation: it is, that I should for the time being establish my See in Upper Louisiana, namely, at St. Louis. Apart from the peremptory motive which brought this idea to my mind, several other reasons seem sufficiently strong to recommend this measure. In order that I may work thoroughly for the good of my Diocese, I must establish a Seminary and primary schools: these new establishments ought to be, until they are solidly grounded, under the immediate and constant supervision of the Bishop. Now everything is against their being located in Lower Louisiana, whereas everything looks favorable to their happy development if they be in Upper Louisiana: in the one place morality is at an incredibly low ebb, it remains untainted

[18] *Arch. of Prop., l.c.*, Cod. 3, Fol. 369.

in the other; in the one the air is unsalubrious, it is pure and healthy in the other; in the one real estate and living are very high, they are very cheap in the other. In case I were to settle in Upper Louisiana, I would appoint only a Vicar General at New Orleans, requesting His Holiness through the Sacred Congregation to grant him the faculty to administer *as I would deem fit* the Sacrament of Confirmation, as the immense distance between the place of my residence and Lower Louisiana would prevent my betaking me thither to fulfill this august function of my Order. In this case, too, it would be necessary to postpone indefinitely the carrying to execution of the project which I had suggested to the Sacred Congregation touching the dismemberment of Upper Louisiana from my Diocese and its erection into a new Diocese.

Bishop Du Bourg's plea was accepted; and from a note of the Secretary of the Congregation of Propaganda added to the original of the above letter, we learn that, in May, 1816, the Cardinal Prefect wrote his approval of the prelate's project. But communications were then very slow; the Bishop, moreover, whose nerves were constantly kept on edge by the correspondence he received from America, was naturally anxious that Rome should be in possession of all the information bearing on the case. He, therefore, on June 24, renewed his petition in another letter to Cardinal Dunagni, adding new light on the misdeeds of Father Anthony and his clique:[19]

Your Eminence:

I had the honor of writing to you from Lyons about the end of April, to acquaint you with the sad news I had just received from New Orleans, submit to you the plan I had formed to establish my residence, at least for a while, in the town of St. Louis, and beseech you to forward as soon as possible your answer to Bordeaux. Since that time, I have been constantly assailed by letters from the same quarter, all very dispiriting, and the trustworthiness of whose writers I cannot question, for these persons are precisely those who are most devoted to me, namely, my brothers, my Vicar General, the Ursuline nuns and others. The uniform burden of all these letters is that, when the news of my Episcopal consecration reached over there, the party began to stir themselves to have the State Legislature pass a law enacting that the Cathedral should be administered by a Board of Trustees, all naturally Father Anthony's abettors;—that, besides, the ringleaders have so roused all the classes of the people against the coming of a Bishop, that my friends believe it would be unsafe for me to go there; at least access to the Cathedral would be denied me, and the Episcopal dignity would be ignominiously

[19] *Arch. of Prop. l.c.*, Cod. 3, Ff. 372-373.

outraged;—that, when my Vicar General brought to Father Anthony the Testimonial of my Consecration and the Brief of His Holiness raising me to the Episcopate, in order to have them registered and filed in the Cathedral Archives, Father Anthony replied derisively that he would consult about the matter with the trustees, one of whom had, shortly after, the impudence to take these documents to a saloon and, on the occasion of them, to aim gibes and insults at the Holy Father and the Bishop;—that Father Anthony boasts that he has nothing to do with the Pope and the Bishops of his making;—that, however, by an unconceivable inconsistency, or maybe a remnant of political timidity, not only he accepts matrimonial dispensations issued in my name by my Vicar General, but even refuses to bless marriages in need of dispensation, until the parties have secured this dispensation from the lawful authority. So that, on the whole, there is actually no schism, but everything is ready for starting one at the first provocation; and the appearance of the Bishop in the country shall not fail to be the signal; so that, not only the respect due to the Episcopal dignity, but the vital interests of religion as well, shall be jeopardized; which must be avoided at all costs, because once the mischief is done, it will be impossible to mend it. From this I might be led to conclude that God does not wish me in my Diocese; and I would not have hesitated to send my resignation to His Holiness, had not the thought occurred to me that St. Louis may offer me a residence where I may settle with greater profit to religion than could ever be found in New Orleans.

However, Your Eminence, before going there, I deemed it necessary to make sure of the kind of welcome I might expect there; for I am told also that the coterie at New Orleans have spared no efforts to poison the minds of the country-people, and as much as they could, of the whole Diocese. In consequence, I have written to Bishop Flaget of Kentucky, who is highly esteemed in Upper Louisiana, and who, being well acquainted with the dispositions of the people there, solicited the erection of a new Episcopal See in that district; I have requested him to urge those people to express themselves plainly, and assign to the Bishop a maintenance independent from the caprice and humor of his flock. My opinion is accordingly that I should wait for their answer before definitely determining to go there.

Upon these various points it is extremely urgent, Your Eminence, that I should have as soon as possible the directions of the Sacred Congregation; for without these directions I act only at haphazard, being obliged to rely solely on my own judgment. I consulted, however, the most enlightened and wise French prelates and ecclesiastics; and all approved of my plan.

Meanwhile, I did not fail to further the work of my Mission; and I have just sent to Upper Louisiana, by the way of Baltimore and Ken-

tucky, five priests, four clerics in minor Orders, and four Brothers,[30]— all well-tried men, to whom I have explained the exact condition of things. Ten or twelve more may possibly be ready to sail by October next; but I will not send these without fear, if I have not the opinion of the Sacred Congregation. I beseech Your Eminence, therefore, to take my position into serious consideration, and, after conferring with the Cardinals of the Congregation on the foregoing *exposé*, to forward me as soon as possible their answer to the following three questions:

1. Owing to the certainty that the Episcopal dignity will be reviled, and to the extremely strong probability that I may personally be exposed to serious danger in New Orleans, is it not advisable to fix, at least provisionally, my residence in St. Louis?

2. Ought I not to wait, before going to St. Louis, for an assurance that I shall be well received there, and find a maintenance?

3. Should I likewise delay until then the departure of the Missionaries who have offered to share in my labors?

Anent the first query, I do not see how there could be two opinions. All persons conversant with the conditions are unanimously saying that attempting to go first to New Orleans would be inexcusable rashness, and a death-blow to Religion. As for myself, Your Eminence, who know better than anyone both the place and the men, I must declare that I do not feel equal to the task of exposing myself to the consequences of such a step.

With regard to the second question, it does not seem to me that the Church's intention is that a Bishop should be a beggar. If the hope of having a resident Bishop does not move the people of Upper Louisiana to settle something definite for his maintenance, still less will they be disposed to do anything, once he is with them, and they know he cannot go anywhere else. I believe it necessary, in consequence, that they should come out with a plain statement, before I go there. Already in April Bishop Flaget has broached the subject, and we may probably know the result of his negotiations before the end of the year.

The solution of the third question depends, in my opinion, upon the answer given to the second. However, I would not see so much inconvenience in an early start of the Missionaries who, at any rate, wish to go to America and are sure of finding work there, than in my own departure at haphazard. This measure may even be necessary for the encouragement of the benefactors of the Mission who seem to reckon on that early start. If, after all, it turns out that I cannot follow my destination, the money given me will thus nevertheless be faithfully applied according to the intention of the donors.

[30] Fathers De Andreis, C.M., Rosati, C.M., Acquaroni, C.M., Carretti and Ferrari of Port-Maurice; Messrs. Dahmen, Deys, Gonzalez and Tichitoli; Blanka, C.M., Flegifont, Boranvanski, de Latre; of these four men only the first was actually a lay-brother, the other three had manifested some intention of joining the Community; none of them eventually persevered. All sailed, on June 12, 1816, on the American brig *The Ranger*.

This letter reached Rome on August 17. We are not in possession of the Cardinal's reply; but from the subsequent correspondence of the Bishop, we may gather that Rome approved of his waiting for Bishop Flaget's information, and directed him to send his Missionaries at once.[21] Anticipating such an answer, he resolved to undertake a campaign through France and Belgium in view of collecting funds and recruiting subjects for the Mission. The King of France, Louis XVIII, granted him free passage for himself and all his Missionaries on the first ship of the Royal navy to sail for America.

Did the authorities at Rome forget the difficult circumstances in which he was, and the approval given to his delaying his departure? It would seem so, from a letter of Propaganda, dated November 23, expressing the Congregation's dissatisfaction, because, "instead of starting for his Diocese, according to the *orders* given him, he had gone to Paris." This unmerited censure caused a severe wound to his sensitive nature; and at once he poured out his heart's feelings in a letter to the Cardinal Pro-Prefect, in which he explained and justified the course he had taken.[22] This letter, received in Rome in the first days of February, produced the desired effect; the mistake was acknowledged, and regret expressed for its commission. But this comforting news had not yet reached the Bishop at the end of March; his heart's wound still bleeding, he once more appealed to the Cardinal:[23]

[21] "I conformed, my Lord, to the orders of Your Eminence on these two points. I have already sent forth thirteen ecclesiastics, nine to St. Louis" (De Andreis' band) "and four to New Orleans." Letter to Card. Dunagni, December, 1816. *Arch. of Prop., l.c., Cod.* 3, Ff. 387-388. Three of the latter, two Frenchmen and one Italian, died prematurely in the fall of 1817. Letter of Father Rosati to Father Baccari, Bardstown, February 8, 1818.

[22] Lyons, December 28, 1816. *Arch. of Prop., l.c.*, Cod. 3, Ff. 387-388. We date this letter with certainty, December 28, although the original bears no date; because, according to a Postcript, Bishop Du Bourg sent at the same time his "Opinion on marriage licences issued by civil authorities in the U. S." This document, which has found place only in Fol. 400 of the *Cod.*, is explicitly dated, Lyons, December 28, 1816. Let it be remarked in passing that the index of this letter in Prof. Carl Russell Fish's *Guide to the Materials for American History in Roman and other Italian Archives*, p. 177 (Washington, D. C., 1911), is misleading: "The Bishop of New Orleans," says the *Guide*, "gives his reasons for *wishing to be transferred to Paris*" (italics mine) "and exposes his projects." The fact of the matter is that the Bishop gives his reasons why he went to Paris, which is quite different.

[23] *Arch. of Prop., l.c.*, Cod. 3, Fol. 425.

Paris, March 29, 1817.

My Lord Cardinal:

Over two months ago, being then at Lyons, I wrote to Your Eminence, to endeavor to clear myself in your eyes of the charge of disobedience. You had upbraided me for my failure to follow your orders of repairing at once to my Diocese. My answer to this allegation was in Your Eminence's very last two letters, wherein you deemed it prudent for me to delay my departure until I should hear about the outcome of the negotiations started by the Bishop of Bardstown with the inhabitants of St. Louis of the Illinois, on the subject of establishing there, at least for a while, my Episcopal See.

If meanwhile I went to Paris, I take God to witness it was in no way for the purpose of winning the good graces of the Royal family, or for any human advantage; but solely for the spiritual benefit of my poor Diocese. Indeed, I went not only to Paris, but also to Belgium, to secure everywhere I could both active laborers and help of every kind; and, thank God, my efforts were not fruitless.

For, besides the thirteen men already arrived in my Diocese[34] (among whom are Fathers De Andreis, Rosati and Acquaroni, of the Roman house of the Mission, Flavian Rossi and Aloysius Bighi, of the Roman College), twenty and more ecclesiastics are ready to sail with me, with whose help we will be able to provide in some way for the foundation of the Seminary and the personnel of the Missions. Moreover, with regard to the expense, His Most Christian Majesty will furnish a ship, the Princes and some good Christians money and a supply of sacred utensils—a very nice liberality in the present straitened circumstances. Nothing now detains me, except that I have to wait for the favorable season to set sail; in May, therefore, or, at the latest, in June next, God willing, we shall be on our way to Baltimore, whence we will go overland and by river-boats to St. Louis.

In the meantime, I hear frequently from my Vicar General who stays all alone in New Orleans: so far, no change has been noticed in the ill-feeling of my opponents; and whatever persons in that depraved city are well disposed towards religion approve my plan to settle in Upper Louisiana, in order that the Episcopal dignity may not be discredited.

It being so, it appears to me urgent that Your Eminence carry out the intention which you were pleased once to manifest to me, namely, to obtain for me from the Holy Father the faculty of delegating a priest to administer the Sacrament of Confirmation, consecrate chalices and altars for that portion of the Diocese which, on account both of the distance and of the hostility still prevailing, I shall be unable to visit.

I had just written this much, when Your Eminence's most welcome and truly fatherly letter of the 5th of February was handed to me. It

[34] So did Bishop Du Bourg think; he did not know then that Bishop Flaget had advised them to wait at Bardstown.

was like balm on my perhaps oversensitive heart, which had felt the wound smarting all the more, because the hand that inflicted it was the dearer. Deign Your Eminence pardon the pain of a son, who beheld him whom he used to look upon as a father, suddenly and without cause that he knew of, assume the stern looks of a judge. Well, God, who is always good, permitted it all, I am sure, to give me a new token of your kindness and of your affection: words fail me to express my gratitude therefor to Your Eminence. No more complaints that my confidence had grown strained. Nay, would that it never overstep the proper bounds of filial confidence.

. . . Whence may have arisen the fear that I should obey the promptings of love of country rather than those of pastoral duty? I have not the least idea, nor do I care to investigate. I even pardon this insult the more readily, because it has afforded me keen satisfaction to hear I have in America friends so good as to set so much value on my worthless efforts. . . .

Bishop Du Bourg's expectations as to the date of his departure were somewhat disappointed. On June 16, he wrote joyfully: "At length the long-wished-for day is at hand: to-morrow we embark, and, God willing, shall set sail for America."[25] Yet, for some cause unexplained in our documents, *La Caravane*, a "flute" of the French Royal Navy, left her moorings at Bordeaux only on July 1.[26] With the prelate were twenty-nine recruits for the Louisiana Mission: five priests, four subdeacons, nine clerics, three Christian Brothers, four young men still in their classical course, and four workmen, who had offered themselves to the Mission and whom the Bishop intended to organize into a kind of community of mechanics.[27]

[25] Letter to Prop. *Arch. of Prop., l.c.*, Cod. 3, Fol. 453.

[26] There can be no doubt as to this date, given by Bishop Spalding, *Flaget*, p. 172. A letter of Mr. Portier and another of Father Anthony Blanc, cited in the *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*, Vol. ii, No. 5, p. 62, and Vol. ii, pp. 334-335, respectively, state explicitly the voyage lasted sixty-five days; and it is certain, on the other hand, that the party landed at Annapolis on September 4.

[27] Various estimates of the number of persons who came on *La Caravane* are current. The list here given is copied from a scrap of paper scribbled in 1820 by Father Rosati, and containing, obviously for his own use and *ne pereant*, the names of all those who came to the Louisiana Mission between 1816 and 1820, with the date of their arrival. This list, which aims at completeness, must be assumed to be correct. It is preserved in the Archives of the Archdiocese of St. Louis. Priests: De Crugy, Anthony Blanc, Janvier, De la Croix, Vallesano; Subdeacons: Bertrand, Portier, Jeanjean, Valentin; Clerics: Brassac, Desmoulins, Hosten, Niel, De Parcq, Maenhaut, De Nekere, Perrodin, Chaudorat; Christian Brothers: Audin, Fulgentius, Antoninus; College Boys: Barreau, De Geithre, Desprat, Magne; of the four workmen we have only the first names: Joseph, Bernard, Isidore, Francis.

The company's life on board ship was as regular and edifying as that of the most fervent seminary; and by word and example the Missionaries inaugurated their apostolic work among their providential travelling companions of *La Caravane*. What consoling success crowned their zealous endeavors, we learn from a letter of Father Anthony Blanc, the future Bishop of New Orleans:[28]

> Our voyage was a little long; but we never regretted this delay, because it was undoubtedly brought about by a special disposition of God, who wished to give us time to prepare the sailors who desired to take the opportunity of our presence on board to fulfill their religious duties. Every day we had a catechetical instruction for the benefit of all who wanted to attend. The first instruction was given by the Bishop himself to the whole crew assembled. We could not but admire the attention with which these poor people were listening. On August 24, eve of St. Louis' feast, the Bishop officiated in the largest and least encumbered room of the ship, and we had the consolation to see forty of the crewmen sit at the Holy Table, seven of whom were making their first communion. Thirty-four of these men received on the same day the sacrament of Confirmation with the most edifying dispositions. In the evening we had a renewal of the promises of Baptism made by those forty who, that morning, had received communion: the Bishop asked the question, and all answered in a loud and manly tone of voice: We promise it! This ceremony was touching in the extreme, and affected deeply the officers, some of whom confessed later on that, on going back to their cabins they could not refrain from shedding tears. On the following Sunday, a few went again to Holy Communion. Most of these men were above twenty-five years of age; a few were around fifty, and said they had neglected their duty for thirty years. We all had our share in this work, some giving the instructions, others hearing confessions. For my own part, I signed seventeen Confirmation tickets. Before we left the ship, they asked us for rosary-beads, which afterwards all were carrying around their necks.

Most touching was the parting scene at Annapolis, when, the Bishop bidding adieu to these neophytes, all fell on their knees and asked a last farewell blessing. "God," adds the chronicler of the *Annales*, "did not wish to expose these good men to the danger of once more losing their souls; on her return trip to France, *La Caravane* was assailed by a fierce hurricane, and nearly all the crew perished at sea."[29]

---

[28] *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*, Vol. ii, pp. 334-335. Cf. Letter of M. Portier, the future Bishop of Mobile: *op. cit.*, t. i, No. 5, p. 62.

[29] *Ann. de la Prop. de la Foi*, Vol. i, No. 1, p. 18.

The safe arrival of the Du Bourg party was notified at once by Father Bruté to Bishop Flaget, who was requested to set out directly with Fathers De Andreis and Rosati, then his guests at Bardstown, in order to make the requisite arrangements for the Bishop's reception and maintenance and for the establishment of the Mission. The whole trip, made on horseback, and lasting from October 1 to November 6, proved one of the most arduous that the stout-hearted Flaget had ever undertaken; but he was wont to look upon hardships as the coin wherewith success is purchased; indeed the success of the delicate negotiations he had come to engage far exceeded his most sanguine anticipations.[30]

The Bishop of Louisiana, after some time spent at St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore (September 10–November 4),[31] set out, on November 4, on his journey westwards, and, on the evening of December 2, accompanied by Father Blanc, and two Kentucky priests[32] sent to Louisville from Bardstown to welcome him, had the happiness of embracing his old friends Bishop Flaget and Father David, and his first company of missioners who had been for a long year awaiting his coming.

He was anxious to get "home." It was agreed that the tireless Bishop of Bardstown should introduce him to his people and install him in his cathedral. Accordingly, on the 12th of December, the two prelates, Father Badin and Mr. Niel, one of the students for the Louisiana Mission,[33] started for St. Louis. The following Sunday (December 14), Bishop Du Bourg preached in the chapel erected by Father Badin at Louisville; and, four days later, the travellers embarked on the steamboat *Piqua*, in hope of completing the voyage in seven days and reaching St. Louis

[30] SPALDING, *Flaget*, pp. 170-171; *Life of De Andreis*, pp. 170–173.

[31] On landing, he left under the care of Father Blanc some of his companions at Annapolis, where they were entertained with princely hospitality until the end of October in the mansion of Charles Carroll of Carrollton. From Annapolis and Baltimore, the party, with the exception of Mr. Portier, who remained at St. Mary's Seminary, went by stage, in three successive bands (the Bishop being in the last) to Pittsburgh, where they embarked on a flat-boat, reaching Louisville on November 30th.

[32] Fathers Chabrat and Schaefer.

[33] Nowhere is that student's name given; it is certain nevertheless the young man was Mr. Francis Niel, later on pastor of St. Louis. He is mentioned by Bishop Du Bourg in a letter to Father Rosati, April 22, 1818, as being in St. Louis.

just for Christmas. Bishop Flaget's humorous pen-picture of the *Piqua* is worth quoting here:

> Nothing could be more original than the medley of persons on board this boat. We have a band of seven or eight comedians, a family of seven or eight Jews, and a company of clergymen composed of a tonsured cleric, a priest, and two Bishops; besides others, both white and black. Thus more than thirty persons are lodged in an apartment (cabin) twenty feet by twelve, which is again divided into two parts. This boat comprises the old and the new testament. It might serve successively for a synagogue, a cathedral, a theater, an hospital, a parlor, a dining room, and a sleeping apartment. It is in fact, a veritable *Noah's Ark*, in which there are both clean and unclean animals—and what is most astonishing, peace and harmony reign here.[34]

The travellers' expectations of a speedy journey were doomed to failure; owing to excessive cold weather, the navigation was seriously hampered by huge ice-floes, and even for two full days the boat was stuck fast in the middle of the river. When, on December 24, painfully the craft reached at last the mouth of the Ohio, the prospect looked still gloomier; and indeed, as the voyagers rose up the next morning they realized with dismay they had not progressed an inch. Unable to say their Christmas Masses, they resolved to make three meditations instead. At the conclusion of the second, the proud *Piqua* resumed her course towards her goal. Slowly she ploughed her way northward, and at length, on the evening of the 28th of December she arrived at the landing near Mrs. Fenwick's farm,[35] where she was to stop a few hours.

There it was the Bishop of Louisiana first set foot in his Diocese. Near the spot a cross prepared for the occasion was solemnly erected whilst the Prelates and their two companions sang the *Vexilla Regis*.[36]

---

[34] SPALDING, *Flaget*, pp. 173-174.

[35] On the north side of the mouth of Apple-Creek, in Perry Co., Mo. Cf. Letter of Bishop Du Bourg to Father Rosati, St. Louis, April 22, 1818. *Archives of St. Louis Archdiocese.*

[36] Letter of Father A. Blanc. *Ann. de la Prop. de la Foi*, Vol. ii, p. 336. Father Blanc repeatedly intimates that the details which he gives were furnished by a letter of Bishop Flaget to Bardstown. Father Rosati's account, in a letter to Father Baccari, dated February 7, 1818, is much more summary; he refers to the same source of information. We shall follow these two guides very closely in the next few pages.

At Fenwick's Father Badin parted with the company. Only twenty miles away lay the "Barrens," where, some twenty years before, a number of his old Kentucky parishioners—as also were the Fenwicks—had come to settle. The occasion to see them was too good to miss; to the "Barrens," therefore, he directed his steps, intending to overtake the Episcopal party a few days later at St. Genevieve.

Returning to the boat, the Bishops "found the comedians performing a play—that is, engaged in a general fight among themselves—until they were separated by the captain."[37] At midnight, on the 30th, they arrived in view of St. Genevieve, and early next morning they despatched a messenger to announce their coming to Father De Andreis.[38] Two hours later, the latter, accompanied by some forty of the principal inhabitants, went on horseback to the landing with several young men likewise on horseback, and a carriage, to escort the prelates into the town. They repaired first to the rectory, where they donned their pontifical vestments; and, a few moments later, headed by the cross and twenty-four altar-boys, the two Bishops, under a canopy carried by four of the principal citizens, were, to the accompaniment of the peal of the church-bells and amidst the universal joy of all the parish assembled, and even of many Protestant members of the community, conducted in solemn procession to the throne erected in the sanctuary of the little village church. With that felicitous cleverness which always put on his lips the right words for the right place, Bishop Du Bourg opened his heart to his St. Genevieve audience, expressing his delight that he was at last in his Diocese, among his own spiritual children, and auguring from this happy event great progress for religion in Upper Louisiana. An enthusiastic *Te Deum* closed the ceremony, and the rest of the day was spent in receiving visits.

On the 1st of January, 1818, the Catholics of St. Genevieve witnessed for the first time the splendors of a Pontifical Mass, cele-

---

[37] SPALDING, *Flaget*, p. 174.

[38] As a result of the arrangements made by Bishop Flaget at St. Louis in October, Father Henry Pratte, pastor of St. Genevieve, had been summoned to St. Louis, to superintend the repairing of the church and rectory; Father De Andreis went to St. Genevieve to take his place.

brated by their Bishop, who once more preached to them; and the next day, the two prelates, Father Badin, who had joined them after his short visit to the "Barrens" settlement, Father De Andreis and Mr. Niel, crossing over to Illinois, resumed their journey towards St. Louis. They arrived the next evening (Saturday, January 3) at Cahokia, where they were welcomed with unbounded transports of joy.[39]

Monday, January 5, had been fixed for the last link of the journey. Forty men of Cahokia, mounted on superb chargers, and marching two by two in perfect order, led the pageant to the bank of the Mississippi River, where a boat was in readiness.[40] On the Missouri side, a large crowd of people, in fact all the inhabitants of the town, Protestants as well as Catholics, were anxiously waiting at the landing;[41] and with faces beaming with joy, after welcoming the prelates in the best French style, led them to the "Episcopal palace," still a sorry looking tumble-down stone house,[42] in spite of Father Pratte's best exertions. Soon after, the two Bishops, mitred and clad in their full pontifical robes, came down the steps, were received under a canopy, and preceded by twelve altar-boys, marched to the gate, and turning northwards along the *Rue de l'Eglise*—now Second Street—reached the door of the cathedral—the rickety log-building erected in 1776—and went up to the sanctuary, where a throne had been prepared, whilst the people filled the church to overflowing. Then Bishop Flaget, leading Bishop Du Bourg to the throne, and installing him in his Episcopal chair, congratulated him on his being now in the midst of his beloved children. The sight of the Pastor, now at last at the end of his two thousand

[39] Father Blanc, in his narrative confounds here Cahokia and Kaskaskias. What he says of the venerable pastor was written indeed about Father Donatian Olivier by the Ladies of the Sacred Heart who paid a visit to the pastor of Prairie du Rocher (of which Kaskaskias was then an out-mission) early in 1818. This description, in very truth, needs no alterations to fit good old Father Savine, then pastor of Cahokia. All these French pioneer priests were of the same sturdy spiritual stock.

[40] A ferry was then plying between the two banks of the river; but the notice intimates a private boat was sent for the Bishop's party.

[41] There was one landing at the foot of Market Street, and another farther north, at the foot of what now is Morgan Street. No doubt the Bishop's party came to the Market Street landing, only a short distance from the cathedral.

[42] "Le palais episcopal . . . ressemble assez à une misérable grange." *Ann. de a Prop. de la Foi*, Vol. i, No. 1, p. 19.

league journey, the view of the flock which he had loved so dearly in the days of their spiritual destitution, and the comforting thought they would henceforth never be in want of religious help, so enraptured the zeal-consumed soul of the speaker, that he could not check tears of bliss and hope. For twenty-four years, the Catholics of St. Louis had known him, from the far-distant day of his coming to Vincennes, his first mission, and they idolized him; but so delicately did he speak to them of their Bishop whom it had been his rôle to herald, that their hearts were completely won to their new pastor.

That this was no mean victory of the eloquence, and still more of the magnetic personality of the Kentucky prelate, Bishop Du Bourg could judge better than anyone else. He had not been, indeed, entirely without misgivings, for he was well aware that the pestilential blast poisoning the Catholic atmosphere in New Orleans had been wafted as far as St. Louis. But this was now past history. Bishop Du Bourg's own winsome personality completed the victory so well won by the eloquent Flaget: "The mere presence of the Bishop," says Father De Andreis, "his kindness, benignity and suavity of manner have dispelled the storm, dissipated in a great measure every prejudice, and captivated all hearts."[43]

Bishop Flaget's mission was now happily completed. On the feast of the Epiphany he preached his farewell sermon, and the next day, in company with Father Badin, he started back for Bardstown by the way of Vincennes. Now at home, Bishop Du Bourg soon was to prove himself, in Upper Louisiana, the efficient instrument of Him "who commands the light to shine out of darkness."

CHARLES L. SOUVAY, C.M.,
Kenrick Seminary,
St. Louis, Mo.

[43] Letter to Father Sicardi, February 24, 1818.

MISCELLANY

I.

A CATHOLIC BIBLIOGRAPHY OF HISTORICAL LITERATURE

It would be carrying water into the Mississippi to offer to the readers of the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW any lengthy argument in favor of a Catholic historical literature. The very words: Inquisition, Martin Luther, Henry VIII, Gregory VII, Alexander VI, suggest some of the topics which are made the object of historical attacks upon the Church and her institutions. But even if there were no such assaults, the Catholic portion of educated America would still remain obliged to contribute its share toward the establishment of truth in so important a branch of human knowledge. Besides, as the early periods of Christianity have found their historians who recorded its trials and triumphs, so the Church looks to us for men who will transmit to posterity the endeavors and achievements of our own times.

Though we are very far from possessing that amount of historical literature which would be in proportion to our numerical strength, the number of historical publications on our side is not quite so small as some faint-hearted souls are inclined to believe. Unfortunately most of what we have is too little known, or, to use a commercial term, too little advertised. We neither read nor consult nor buy nor recommend these books as much as they deserve. Of some precious volumes, perhaps, we have never heard. Others are not unknown to us; but since we have not been obliged to use them for some time, they have escaped our memory in the moment when they would be most useful.

For all these reasons a CATHOLIC LIST OF HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS is a desideratum. It would serve the beginner as an introduction to this important section of literature, and would appeal not only to those who either teach or study history, but also to the general public. It could be kept upon the study table and at the editorial desk, placed in Catholic and other libraries, and serve even the bookseller in replenishing his stock. Hence a few words on a Catholic Bibliography of historical writings are perhaps not unwelcome to the readers of this REVIEW.[1]

It is designedly that I put the word "Catholic" before the term "List" and not before "Historical Publications." In our ideal list

[1] This article is more or less along the lines of a communication sent to the Buffalo Convention of the Catholic Educational Association, which is reprinted in the official *Report* (1917) on pp. 192–196.

we should, I think, by no means exclude such *works of non-Catholics* as contain practically no errors. In many sections we have no equivalent to offer. Besides, it is hardly necessary to emphasize a Catholic viewpoint on certain matters, the Peloponnesian War, for instance. But the catalogue as such must be Catholic. Whatever books we admit to it must at least not be anti-Catholic nor such as are likely to endanger the faith of those who will peruse them. But there is no reason why we should not recommend good and useful books by non-Catholics to enable our teachers and students to get the best of everything. Appropriate remarks can warn against isolated misstatements or erroneous tendencies.

As to the *books of Catholic authors*,[2] however, the list should be as complete as possible. Even books that are out of print should not easily be omitted, as they may be consulted in libraries or acquired second hand. To give an instance, *The Making of Italy*, by The O'Cleary (an Irish officer in the papal army of 1870) will for a long time remain the classic on this subject, though it is almost impossible to get hold of a copy. In this way attention may be called to some volumes tucked away in a pastor's or family library, which otherwise would be in danger of being thrown upon the rubbish pile.

We have a goodly number of *biographies*, many of which possess great historical value. A class by themselves are the *historical novels*, which often draw a more vivid picture of actual conditions than serious history, and are apt to provoke an appetite for more solid mental food.

Present-day historians have produced one particular kind of books, with which we Catholics have every reason to be satisfied. I refer to the collections and translations of *historical sources* whether original or secondary. Of supreme value are original sources. We want to get the truth and get it if possible at first hand. However, not all of them,

---

[2] It may be well to forestall right here an objection often encountered, namely, that fable that Catholic books as a class are inferior to those produced by non-Catholics. They are, it is said, deficient in style, their make-up is poor, and yet the price is comparatively much higher. This may be the case with some of them, but it remains to be proved that it is so with the greater number. *As a class they possess one inestimable advantage*: they are correct in regard to Faith and Morals. This outweighs many a disadvantage and well deserves to be paid for by a higher price. We Catholics have to pay for our religion by maintaining churches and schools, by giving up lucrative positions if they become for us proximate occasions of sin, and by letting alone unlawful means in the pursuit of temporal profit. We must be prepared to make financial sacrifices for correct books as well. It is my personal opinion, however, that generally speaking the volume produced by the Catholic author and publisher is not more expensive than any of those hailing from other sources. At any rate, *we must make the best of what we have.*

33930

can be recommended without restriction. In some of them the documents have not always been selected without bias; others give inaccurate translations; and others embody their errors in introductions and notes.

How to be carried out. Who should take the lead in this matter—the Catholic University, or the Catholic Educational Association or the International Catholic Truth Society, or the United States Catholic Historical Society or the American Catholic Historical Society? I do not care to answer this question. I only wish to remark that better results are likely to be obtained if the task is divided among many workers according to periods or phases of history or the sundry classes of historical literature.

But a beginning must be made. No doubt many of those who are teaching or studying history can compile a catalogue of books on some particular point. It may be that some have already done so. Let them begin by publishing the fruits of their labor in some Catholic magazine or newspaper. Let them not wait for a commander-in-chief to give the signal. Let them not think that possibly they are duplicating labor. Maybe they are, but what of it? The work of compiling is instructive by itself. The compiler can only gain by it and become a better judge of the work of others. Noisy renown the work will not bring; the compiler will not be deluged with letters. Yet like the Arrow and Song in Longfellow's poem his list will land in some place where it will be welcome. It will reach the silent scholar, who has been waiting for something of this sort. Here it will be clipped out and preserved for reference as a labor-saving device. The compiler should, however, not fail to mail it personally to those whom he thinks are interested. As it is understood that such short bibliographies are at the free disposal of other volunteers, they will become more and more consolidated and finally coalesce into one or several larger annotated catalogues.

To make this labor more practical and fruitful, the title, the names of author and publisher, and the year of printing (or copyright) should be as accurately given as possible. Nor should the price be omitted; commercial though this looks, it is useful and will save much trouble to prospective buyers.

There should be as many *notes* as are desirable to characterize the book. Sometimes the title is sufficient for this purpose, though short remarks are nearly always useful. They may be based, best of all, upon the compiler's own observation, or be culled from the preface, or from some review, or may simply consist of a few items of the table of contents. If the book is not unobjectionable, this circumstance must of course be mentioned and some corrective suggestion added.

This method will bring out many details which otherwise might be overlooked. It will at the same time contribute greatly toward stimulating a more general interest in this class of literature. Kindly criticism must be freely offered and will be taken in good part.[3]

Let me remind the editors of periodical publications that an annotated list of books on any subject would be as good a contribution as many a pretentious article and perform a great service to the cause of Catholicity. Such bibliographies should not be considered as a kind of advertisement, for which the publishers of the books are expected to pay. The spread of good books will strengthen the spirit of religion in general and will in the end redound to the intellectual as well as pecuniary advantage of the Catholic press.

As the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW is dedicated to *American History*, a word concerning the literature of the history of our own country may be in place. Many of our Catholic publications of this kind are not simply literature but participate in the nature of sources. Parishes, districts, dioceses, and states possess printed accounts of the establishment and progress of Catholicity and Catholic institutions. Though with little care, some of them might have been made more useful, still even as they are they cannot be despised. Here belong also the biographies of American prelates, priests and other prominent Catholics. Will not someone—or someones—prepare for us a catalogue of them?

Such books are often found in the libraries of the older clergy; and in case of death of their owner they run the risk of being disposed of by the pound to the rag peddler. A little foresight could secure them for the diocesan seminary or some other ecclesiastical institution where they will be appreciated, preserved, and in due time render valuable service.

F. S. BETTEN, S.J.,
St. Ignatius College,
Cleveland, Ohio.

[3] To make a beginning I have already published, in Preuss' *Fortnightly Review* (July 1, 1917, p. 195ff.) the book list which is appended to my *Ancient History*. It does not claim to be perfect.

II.

THE HIERARCHY IN OUR COLONIAL POSSESSIONS

No sketch of the Catholic Hierarchy would not be complete without a word about the Church in our Colonial possessions.[1]

I. Porto Rico.

The first place among these belongs to Porto Rico. Pope Julius II (Nov. 15, 1504) established the first ecclesiastical province in the New World, which was shortly afterward suppressed. Seven years later (August 8, 1511), the same Pope erected three new dioceses, one of which was in the Island of San Juan, the name now given solely to the chief City of Porto Rico, but which then applied to the whole Island. These new dioceses were made suffragans of the Province of Seville, Spain. The Diocese of Porto Rico (since Feb. 20, 1903) is subject immediately to the Holy See.

The Reverend *Alonso Manso*, Canon of the Cathedral of Salmanaca, who had been elected Bishop of Magua, one of the suppressed sees, was transferred to San Juan, of which he took possession two years later in 1513, being the first bishop to reach the New World. There have been fifty occupants since the erection of the see. The first American bishop was the *Most Rev. James H. Blenk* who was appointed June 12, 1899, and became Archbishop of New Orleans April 20, 1906. He died April 20, 1917. The present bishop is the *Right Rev. William A. Jones*, O.S.A., born at Cambridge, N. G., July 21, 1865, consecrated February 24, 1907. The diocese has 129 priests, 93 churches and the Catholic population is placed at 1,000,000.

II. The Philippine Islands

The Islands constitute the Province of Manila. The Diocese of Manila was erected in 1581 and was made an archdiocese in 1585.

---

[1] Cf. Bishop Corrigan's articles on the *Catholic Hierarchy of the United States*, in the *Catholic Historical Reveiw*, Vol. I, 367; Vol. II, pp. 127, 283; Vol. III, pp. 22, 151. In the last article on *The Hierarchy of the United States*, by an oversight, the diocese of Sioux City, Iowa was omitted from the Province of Dubuque. This Diocese was erected January 15, 1902, by Pope Leo XIII, who detached from the Archdiocese of Dubuque twenty-four counties in the northwestern part of Iowa with an area of 14,518 square miles. The first and present bishop is the Right Reverend Philip J. Garrigan, born January 25, 1840, and ordained June 11, 1870. He was appointed March 21, 1902, and was consecrated May 25, 1902. The Rev. Edmund H. Heelan, Rector of the Sacred Heart Church, Fort Dodge, Iowa, has recently been appointed auxiliary to Bishop Garrigan.

The first American archbishop was the *Most Rev. Jeremiah J. Harty* appointed June 6, 1903. He is now bishop of Omaha, to which he was transferred May 16, 1916. The present archbishop is the *Most Rev. Michael J. O'Doherty*, appointed Bishop of Zamboanga, June 19, 1911, and translated to Manila, September 6, 1916. The Suffragan Sees of Manilla are:

1. The Diocese of Cebu erected August 14, 1595. The first American bishop was the *Right Rev. Thomas A. Hendrick* consecrated at Rome, August 23, 1903. He died November 29, 1909. The present bishop is the *Right Rev. Juan P. Gorordo*, consecrated as auxiliary, June 24, 1909, and made Bishop of Cebu April 2, 1910.

2. The diocese of Nueva Segovia, erected August 14, 1595. The first American bishop was the *Right Rev. Denis J. Dougherty* appointed July 10, 1908. He is now Bishop of Buffalo, to which See he was transferred December 5, 1915. The second American bishop was the *Right Rev. James J. Carroll*, consecrated February 14, 1909. His health compelled him to resign. He was made titular Bishop of Metellopolis, became Rector of St. Edward's Parish in Philadelphia, and died April 4, 1913. The present bishop is the *Right Rev. Peter Joseph Hurth*, C.S.C. He was appointed Bishop of Dacca, East Indies, June 26, 1894, titular Bishop of Melopotamus, February 15, 1909, and Bishop of Nueva Segovia January 7, 1913.

3. The Diocese of Nueva Caceres, erected August 15, 1595. The first bishop appointed after American occupation was the *Right Rev. Jorge Barlin Imperial* consecrated June 29, 1906. He died at Rome, September 5, 1909. The present bishop is the *Right Rev. John B. MacGinley*, appointed April 2, 1910.

4. The Diocese of Jaro, erected May 27, 1865. The first American Bishop, who was the fourth occupant of the See was the *Right Rev. Frederick Z. Rooker*, consecrated June 14, 1903. He died in 1907 and was succeeded by Bishop Dougherty the present Bishop of Buffalo. The present bishop is the *Right Rev. Maurice Foley* transferred to this diocese in succession to Bishop Dougherty, September 6, 1916. Pope Pius X, April 10, 1910, erected four new dioceses in the Philippines: Calbayog, Lipa, Tuguegarao and Zamboanga.

5. The first and present bishop of Calbayog is the *Right Rev. Pablo Singzon* appointed April 12, 1910, and consecrated June 12, 1910.

6. The first bishop of Lipa was the *Right Rev. Joseph Petrelli*, who was at the time secretary of the apostolic Delegate Monsignor Agius. He was appointed April 12, 1910, and was consecrated June 12, 1910. He is now titular Archbishop of Nisibis and Apostolic Delegate in the Philippine Islands. The present bishop is the *Right Rev. Alfredo Verzosa*, appointed September 6, 1916.

7. The first bishop of Tuguegarao was the *Right Rev. Maurice P. Foley*, appointed September 10, 1910. He is now Bishop of Jaro. The present bishop is the *Right Rev. James Sancho*, appointed February 5, 1917.

8. The *Right Rev. Charles Warren Currier* was appointed Bishop of Zamboanga, but he declined, and the first bishop was the *Right Rev. Michael J. O'Doherty*, appointed June 19, 1911. He was transferred to Manila, September 6, 1916. The present bishop is the *Right Rev. James McCloskey*, appointed February 5, 1917, and consecrated May 1, 1917.

III. The Hawaiian Islands

These comprised a prefecture Apostolic from 1827 to 1840, when they were made a part of the Vicariate Apostolic of Oceania. In 1847 the Vicariate Apostolic of the Hawaiian Islands was established. The present Vicar, the fourth in succession, is the *Right Rev. Libertus Boeynaems*, titular Bishop of Zeugma, appointed April 8, 1903 and consecrated July 25, 1903.

IV. Guam

The Island of Guam, which is also a possession of the United States, constitutes a Vicariate Apostolic, erected March 1, 1911. The Vicar is the *Right Rev. Joachim Olaiz y Zabalza*, a Capuchin, who is titular Bishop of Docimeo. He was appointed July 20, 1914 and was consecrated November 30, 1914.

V. Samoa

The United States' possessions in Samoa, with a Catholic population of about 1,000, form a part of the Vicariate Apostolic of the Navigator Islands. The Vicar is the *Right Rev. Peter Broyer*, Marist, titular Bishop of Polemonium, appointed March 30, 1896.

VI. The Virgin Islands

And, finally, the Virgin Islands, which have recently been purchased from Denmark, by the United States, form a part of the Diocese of Roseau, of which the present bishop is the *Right Rev. Philip Schelfhaut*, C.SS.R. Born in Belgium, September 27, 1850, he was ordained October 18, 1878, and was consecrated, March 16, 1902. The different islands of the Carribean Sea, which constitute the Diocese of Roseau, belonged to the Vicariate Apostolic of Port of Spain up to April 30, 1850, when Pope Pius IX erected an episcopal see at Roseau, the capital of Dominica. The first bishop was the *Right Rev. Michael Monaghan*, consecrated February 16, 1851. He died, August 14,

1855, and was succeeded by the *Right Rev. Michael Vesque*, who died August 10, 1859. The third bishop was the *Right Rev. René Marie Charles Poirier*, C.J.M., who governed the diocese from 1859 to 1878. Then came the *Right Rev. Michael Naughton* from 1880 to July 4, 1900. The diocese comprises the Island of Dominica with 30,000 Catholics; Montserrat with 600; St. Kitts, 1,500. In the smaller islands there are so few Catholics that no priest has ever been resident. The Island of St. Thomas has one parish, one church, three priests and one chapel, and 3,000 Catholics; St. Croix has two parishes, four priests, two churches and one chapel, with 4,100 Catholics. These two last islands are now United States territory. The total Protestant population is about 100,000. With the exception of two parishes served by diocesan priests, the whole diocese is under the care of the Redemptorist Fathers of the Belgian Province and of the Fathers of Mary Immaculate. Quite recently the Belgian Redemptorists have been replaced by Fathers of the American Province.

RIGHT REV. O. B. CORRIGAN, D.D.,
Baltimore, Md.

DOCUMENTS

SELECTED LETTERS FROM THE ROUX CORRESPONDENCE (1833-34)

(*Contributed by the Rev. Gilbert J. Garraghan, S.J., of St. Louis University*)

The three letters of Father Benedict Roux which are reproduced here are selected from his unpublished correspondence with Bishop Rosati now preserved in the Archives of the Archdiocese of St. Louis. Their historical value may be estimated by the circumstance that they contain the earliest account extant of the exercise of the Catholic ministry in one of the largest and most progressive centres of population in the country—Kansas City, Missouri.

Material for a biographical sketch of Father Benedict Roux is exceedingly scarce. It has been impossible to ascertain accurately the year of his birth nor is anything on record in regard to his career, prior to his coming to America, in 1831. He was one of the five French ecclesiastics who were sent in the course of that year by the Association for the Propagation of the Faith to the Saint Louis Diocese. Father Roux came from the Diocese of Lyons, France. One of his companions, Mr. St. Cyr, a sub-deacon, was sent immediately after his ordination to the priesthood in April, 1833, to Chicago to found the first Catholic parish in that city.[1] The two priests had crossed the Atlantic together and were to become fast friends in their pioneer missionary work in the West. Father St. Cyr may truly be styled the pioneer priest of the church in Chicago and Father Roux possesses the same honor in Kansas City. Attached to the St. Louis Cathedral as assistant-priest in May, 1831, Father Roux set out at once to master the English tongue. His first lessons were received from Bishop Rosati. His purpose in coming to America was to evangelize the Indians. Nothing else, he told Bishop Rosati, would have induced him to come to what was then the Far West. We find him, in 1833, residing with the Jesuit Fathers of St. Charles, Mo., with the Spencer family of Dardenne, Mo., and with the Kelly family of St. Charles, Mo., still endeavoring to acquire a command of the vernacular, in which pursuit he received valuable assistance from his successive hosts, as he informs Bishop Rosati on February 17, 1833.

Early in 1833 Father Roux was in correspondence with Bishop Rosati with a view to securing an appointment as missionary among the Indians. It was his desire to evangelize the Indians, so he assured his ecclesiastical Superior, that had brought him to America and this desire, he added, had been formally approved by the Central Council of the Association for the Propagation of the Faith to whom he had manifested it before his departure from France. A report that the Bishop of St. Louis was about to open a mission among the Osage Indians led Father Roux to offer himself eagerly for the post. But no such mission was established or perhaps even seriously considered. An abor-

[1] For an account of Father St. Cyr's labors in Chicago (1833–37), cf. *The Catholic Church in Chicago*, p. 3, Chicago, 1891; ANDREWS, *History of Chicago*, p. 61.

tive attempt in 1828 on the part of one of the St. Louis diocesan priests, Father Joseph Lutz, to establish himself as resident missionary among the Kaw Indians, very probably deterred Bishop Rosati from promoting a similar venture until better conditions for its success should be at hand. At all events, Bishop Rosati in the fall of 1833 commissioned Father Roux, apparently at his own request, to go to the Missouri frontier, not as an Indian apostle, but as a missionary-priest to the scattered groups of Catholic settlers in that quarter of the St. Louis Diocese. As it turned out, apart from one or two visits to the Kickapoo Indians near Fort Leavenworth, Father Roux's ministry during his stay in Western Missouri was confined exclusively to the whites. He arrived on the site of what is now Kansas City on November 14, 1833. As soon as circumstances permitted, he began to exercise the ministry among the Catholics of the locality, consisting of twelve French or Creole families, and took steps towards the organization of a parish, with a church and presbytery. His stay continued until the end of April, 1835, when he returned to St. Louis on a visit, having previously reported to Bishop Rosati that the extreme poverty of his parishioners made it impossible for them to support a resident pastor. Notwithstanding his expressed desire to be permitted to return to "the mouth of the Kansas River," despite the trying conditions which prevailed there, Father Roux was now assigned to the Immaculate Conception parish of Kaskaskia, Illinois. Here he remained until 1839, the historic old church being razed during his incumbency as pastor to make room for a more modern structure. He was succeeded at Kaskaskia by his early associate and countryman, Father Irenaeus St. Cyr. During the years 1842–1846 Father Roux was one of the assistant priests at the St. Louis Cathedral. His name does not appear in the *Catholic Almanac* for 1847, nor in subsequent issues, either in the lists of the living or in the Necrology. He apparently withdrew from the Diocese of St. Louis in the course of 1846 and returned to France.

The place of distinction that must ever remain to Father Roux in the ecclesiastical history of the West is due to the significant fact that he laid the foundations of Catholicity in one of the largest and most prosperous centers of population in the country, Kansas City, Missouri.[2] Father Roux was the first *resident* priest of Kansas City. The names of three other priests have found their way into history as having preceded Father Roux in the exercise of the ministry, though in a transient way, in that locality.[3] Father Charles de la Croix, parish priest of Florissant, Mo., who visited the Osage Indians in 1821 and again in 1822, is said to have ministered in the course of these missionary journeys to the French settlers at the mouth of the Kansas. It is known that he officiated at the Osage village, situated near Papinsville, Bates Co., Mo., about sixty miles to the south of Kansas City; that he was at the latter place also is vouched for by an apparently well founded tradition, but is not borne out by any documentary evidence which the writer of these notes is acquainted with. Father Charles Van Quickenborne, Indian mission-

[2] For convenience sake the designation, Kansas City, is used here freely, though historically the *Town* of Kansas, later Kansas City, came into existence only after Father Roux's time.

[3] C. W. WHITNEY, *History of Kansas City*, Vol. i, p. 292.

ary and founder of the Missouri Province of the Society of Jesus, is also said to have visited the locality in question in the course of the missionary trips he made to the Osage Indians in 1827, 1828 and 1830. No verification of this statement is obtainable. The Father's letters descriptive of his Osage excursions of 1827 and 1828, which are published in the *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*, T. iii, iv, give no indication that he visited the Catholic settlers at Kawsmouth on these occasions. The first *recorded* visit of Father Van Quickenborne to this locality occurred in the summer of 1835 (*Annales*, etc., T. ix, 99). Finally, Father Joseph Lutz, the first priest of German birth to be attached to the Diocese of St. Louis, and a resident missionary among the Kaw or Kansas Indians in the summer of 1828, visited the French Catholics at the outlet of the Kansas River on a few occasions during his stay in the west. A contemporary report of his, addressed to Bishop Rosati and containing references to the aforementioned visits, is the earliest document we possess for the history of pioneer Catholicity in Kansas City.[4] Father Roux's baptisms are the *earliest* recorded for Kansas City. They range from February 23, 1834 to April 25, 1835 and are forty-eight in number, thirty-six of whites, seven of negroes and five of Indians. (A few of the baptisms were performed outside of the Kansas City site, but near the Missouri frontier). Father Roux acquired the property on which was built subsequently to his return to St. Louis, though the contract was let before that date, the *first* Catholic church in Kansas City. This pioneer structure of logs stood at about the intersection of Eleventh and Penn streets, in immediate proximity to the present Cathedral site. Both in a spiritual and a material way, Catholicity in Kansas City goes back for its beginnings to the pastorate of Father Roux.

The sources available for the life of Father Roux are scarce. Printed material on his work in Kansas City is practically non-existant. The following titles supply all the available information on the topic in print: *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi*, v. 584, 586, 597; *Metropolitan Catholic Calendar* (also *Catholic Almanac*), issues of 1834–1846; *Encyclopaedia of the History of Missouri*, i, article, *Catholic, Church in Kansas City*, by Reverend W. J. Dalton; WHITNEY, *History of Kansas City, Missouri*, i, 402; CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, October, 1917, article, *Catholic Church Annals of Kansas City*, by Very Reverend W. Keuenhof, V.G. This article contains a detailed account, not available elsewhere, of the property purchased by Father Roux. As manuscript material, there are the property-deeds in the public *Land Records* of Jackson County, and a transcript of Father Roux's *Baptismal Records* in the Chancery Office of the Diocese of Kansas City which furnish a few data. Father Roux's own letters hitherto unpublished and now resting in the Historical Archives of the Archdiocese of St. Louis are by far the most important manuscript source we possess concerning him and his missions. These letters, forty-three in number, are, with two exceptions only, written in French, and are addressed in every instance but one, to Bishop Rosati. Of the collection, eleven, which are dated *de la Rivière des Kans.*, or *de l'embouchure de la Rivière*

[4] Cf. St. Louis *Pastoral-Blatt*, September, 1917, p. 129; article— "Abbée Joseph Anton Lutz.

des Kans., constitute a unique record at first hand of Father Roux's experiences as the first resident priest of Kansas City. The text of three of these letters, with accompanying English translation, is subjoined. For permission to publish these interesting documents, acknowledgment is here gratefully made to the Rt. Rev. John J. Tannrath, Chancellor of the Archdiocese of St. Louis.

De l'embouchure de la Rivière des Kans, 24 9^{bre} 1838.

Monseigneur,

J'ai différé jusqu'à présent de vous écrire afin de vous donner quelque chose de précis sur ma mission dans ces parages-ci. Le contenu de cette lettre, je n'en doute pas vous intéressera et réjouira votre coeur. Je suis arrivé le quatre de ce mois à Liberty dans Cley (Clay) County chez Mr. Curtis; lui, Mde. Benoist, ses deux demoiselles et Mr. Riley, un de ses gendres, m'ont acceuilli avec le plus grand plaisir; Je leur ai raconté en peu de mots le sujet de ma mission; ils l'ont approuvé avec acclamation, et avec un extérieur qui me promettait leur assistance dans toutes mes entreprises religieuses. Le 5 j'ai laissé Liberty pour aller chez Mr. Hughes, celui qui a eu l'honneur de vous écrire plusieurs fois au sujet d'un établissement de Soeurs pour l'éducation des jeunes demoiselles de sa contrée. Je l'ai trouvé perséverant toujours dans cette bonne intention. Il voudrait que cet établissement se fît sur Clinton County à trente milles de Liberty, au nord de celui de Cley (Clay). Dans ce nouveau comté se trouve Mr. Michel qui possède ainsi que Mr. Hughes une grande étendue de cette terre. L'avantage qu'ils font aux Soeurs n'est point à dédaigner; ils leur allouent une terre de cent soixante acres bien située, bien boisée, enrichie de plusieurs sources, et une maison prête à être habitée; et pour compléter la bonne oeuvre, leur ai-je dit avec gaieté, il faudrait assurer au prêtre au moins une quarantaine d'acres afin qu'il ait de quoi bêcher, cultiver pour fournir un peu à sa subsistance. Les raisons que je leur ai données à ce sujet leur ont paru si justes qu'ils ont condescendu sans peine à ma demande. Nous n'avons qu'une famille catholique dans ce nouveau comté, c'est celle de Mr. Michel. Selon Mr. Hughes beaucoup de familles catholiques se préparent à émigrer du Kentuki pour venir l'habiter le printemps prochain. Le 10 j'ai quitté Mr. Michel et Mr. Hughes et je me suis enretourné à Liberty où nous avons deux familles catholiques, Celle de Mr. Curtis et celle de Mr. Riley, (les deux gendres de Mde. Benoist.) J'aurais bien désiré que l'établissement religieux se fût élevé à Liberty m^me, car la population y est très-considérable; on l'évalue à 600, mais les préjudices contre notre religion y sont trop forts; Le temps n'est pas encore venu d'y rien faire de considérable. Le 12 je suis allé à l'Indépendance, Jackson County, à 15 milles de Liberty, au sud de cette petite ville; là j'ai visité les deux familles Roy, les seules catholiques que nous avons dans cet endroit. Nous n'avons pas espérance d'y en avoir plus pour le présent, car les préjudices là contre notre croyance sont aussi forts qu'à Liberty. Cependant, Monseigneur, je ne désespère pas, juvante Deo, après avoir preparé avec soin quelques instructions en anglais, d'y faire quelques fruits; l'ignorance de notre religion dans les habitants de l'une et l'autre ville, est pour ainsi dire crasse. Le 14 j'ai pris congé des deux familles et je suis parti au village français, où New Ville Poche, à 12 milles de l'Indépendance (Ouest), J'ai fait ma résidence quelques jours chez Mr. Guesseau Chouteau. Je lui ai ouvert toutes mes intentions; aussitôt il a convoqué une assemblée des catholiques de l'endroit, sur les moyens d'avoir une église et d'entretenir un prêtre. J'ai trouvé tout le monde bien disposé et prêt à faire tous les sacrifices raisonnables. On est convenu d'assurer au prêtre 40 acres de terre pour y placer une église, un presbytère, et pour avoir un petit terrain à

cultiver. Je ne doute pas un instant que cet établissement ne réussisse, car MM. Guesseau et Cyprien Chouteau en sont les deux piliers et le prennent très à coeur. Mr. Guesseau s'est chargé de mettre en contribution les bourses de MM. Chouteau de St. Louis et de Mr. Ménard de Kaskakias. Vous voyez que l'assistance de tous ces bons et généreux Messieurs ne nuira point aux vues religieuses que nous nous proposons. Nous espérons avoir cet établissement vera la fin du mois de juin de l'année prochaine et si j'avais à présent mon cher Mr. Bouvet avec moi nous en jouirions avant cette époque. Je veux rendre cette place susceptible de recevoir des religieuses avant la fin de l'année prochaine. Une pareille institution dans ce pays ci produirait dans l'endroit et les environs les fruits les plus merveilleux, les plus avantageux à notre ste. religion; pour cela il faudrait que j'eusse deux religieuses propres à enseigner l'anglais et une autre le français avec les autres branches d'éducation. Si la maison des Dames du Sacré Coeur voulait s'y prêter, vous trouveriez ou à St. Louis ou à la Louisiane tout ce que je désire. Je ne doute pas, Monseigneur, que vous ne fassiez quelques démarches pour seconder mes vues qui tourneront toutes je l'espère à l'avantage de votre diocèse et de la religion. Donc deux nouveaux établissements ou églises nous sont comme assurés l'un dans Jackson County, à deux milles environ audessous de la Rivière des Kans, et l'autre dans Clinton County à 30 milles nord de Liberty.

Je n'ai pas encore exercé aucune fonction du ministère. L'occasion ne m'a jamais été favorable. La semaine prochaine je désignerai l'endroit où je commencerai à exercer l'office du prêtre. J'ai déja dit devant l'assemblée des catholiques que j'ai tenue que je baptiserais d'abord les petits enfants, que j'instruirais ceux qui étaient dans l'âge de raison avant de les baptiser, que je préparerais et ferais faire la 1ère. Communion aux personnes disposées et qui n'avaient pas encore eu ce bonheur, et enfin que je viendrais aux hommes; ces dernières paroles les ont fait sourire.

Je suis ce moment ci à la trading house de MM. Chouteau; là je suis très bien, nourriture, feu, logement, tout est préparé pour moi avec le plus grand soin. Je ne saurais trop faire à ce sujet l'éloge de Mr. Guesseau Chouteau, de son épouse et de son frère: ils ont pour moi les plus grands égards; mais je ne pense pas y rester longtemps, parce qu'ils sont au milieu des terres sauvages, trop éloignés des catholiques pour que je puisse vaquer facilement à mon ministère. J'ai intention d'aller me fixer au milieu de la congrégation française, pourvu que j'aye du pain de maïs et du lait je suis content. J'aurais eu beaucoup de choses à vous dire, mais le papier me manque. Vous les trouverez dans les lettres de Mr. Borgna et de Mr. Lutz. Vous connaissez, Monseigneur, mon sincère attachement pour vous et mon dévouement pour votre diocèse; daignez agréer les sentiments respectueux de celui qui est et qui se reconnaitra toujours,

Monseigneur

Votre très humble et très obéissant serviteur

Br. Roux.

N. B. 1°. Où nous avons le plus de catholiques c'est dans Jackson County et encore sont-ils en petit nombre. Nous n'avons là qu'une douzaine de familles françaises; mais elles m'occuperont pendant quelque temps, car il y a beaucoup d'enfants à baptiser à préparer à la 1ère. Communion; les instructions ne prendront pas peu de mon temps.

N. B. 2°. Toutes les fois qu'il s'est agi de faire quelque établissement dans votre diocèse vous avez toujours souscrit généreusement pour en faciliter l'érection. Il me semble, Monseigneur, que j'ai quelque droit à vos générosités, puisque nous nous

employons ici à ajouter deux établissements à votre diocèse, lesquels promettent beaucoup pour le religion, soit du côté des catholiques qui se préparent à venir ici en foule, soit du côté des Américains qui ayant la facilité d'avoir des instructions régulières sur notre religion, rentreraient, je n'en doute pas, dans le sein de la véritable église; soit enfin du côté des sauvages qui viendraient par curiosité à notre Eglise et se sentiraient malgré eux, à embrasser notre religion. Les deux établissements se trouvent à la porte des sauvages. Je ne doute pas un instant que vous les encouragiez par des moyens physiques.

N. B. 3°. Le Prophète des Kikapoos a deux fils très gentils, annonçans comme leur père d'heureuses dispositions pour la religion; s'il était possible d'en faire recevoir un aux Barrens pour y faire ses études religieuses, Dieu peut être pourrait l'appeler au sacerdoce; de là quelles grandes conquêtes s'en suivraient pour la religion. J'aurais beaucoup de belles choses à vous dire sur cette nation, les quelles j'ai entendu de mes propres oreilles et vu de mes propres yeux, car j'ai fait dernièrement un voyage d'une petite semaine chez les Poos et les Kikapoos, j'ai été reçu chez eux comme un ange envoyé du ciel. Le temps ne me permet pas de vous en faire part à présent. Il suffit que je vous dise que ce sont de véritables catholiques de désir, et des catholiques de désir tels que leur vie vous donne une parfaite image de celle des chrétiens de la primitive église. Nous devons prier pour ces deux nations, car elles prient elles-mêmes continuellement pour les Robes noires; afin qu'ils viennent à leur secours pour leur montrer le chemin du Ciel. Ces peuples prient journellement le matin, le soir et avant leurs repas; ils sanctifient le jour du dimanche comme nous et le passent entièrement à la prière. Ils ne jurent point, ne font pas la guerre, ne mentent point, n'ont qu'une femme; ils croient au Ciel, au Purgatoire et à l'Enfer, honorent la Ste. Vierge et les Saints, etc. Je ne finirais pas si je voulais vous raconter tout ce que j'ai vu d'édifiant parmi eux. Veuillez me faire réponse si vous conservez la juridiction sur les Indiens de l'ouest; parce que j'irais de temps en temps les visiter.

(*Translation*)

From the mouth of the Kansas River[1]

November 24, 1833.

Monseigneur,

I have put off writing to you until now in order that I might have something definite to report to you in regard to my mission in these parts. The contents of this letter, I have no doubt, will interest you and gladden your heart. I arrived on the 4th of this month at Liberty, in Clay County, and put up at Mr. Curtis'; together with Madame Benoist, her two daughters, and Mr. Riley, one of her sons-in-law, Mr. Curtis gave me a very hearty welcome. I told them in a few words the object of my mission. They were loud in their approval and from all outward indications, I felt assured of their assistance in all my religious undertakings. On the 5th I left Liberty to go to Mr. Hughes' place. This is the gentleman who has had the honor of writing to you several times in regard to a house of Sisters for the education of the young ladies of his locality. I found him steadily persevering in this good intention.

[1] As early as 1821 Francis Gesseau Chouteau, son of Jean Pierre Chouteau and grandson of Laclede, the founder of St. Louis, established an agency of the American Fur Company on the right bank of the Missouri a short distance below the mouth of the Kansas. Other Frenchmen, chiefly traders, trappers and voyageurs, with their families soon joined Chouteau and thus formed the first permanent white settlement on the site of Kansas City. Westport, now included within the corporate limits of Kansas City, was an older settlement than the latter, having been laid out as a town in 1833. Francis Parkman, the historian, who visited the Missouri frontier in 1846, has a pen-picture of Westport in his *Oregon-Trail*, but makes no mention of Kansas City.

He would like this settlement to be in Clinton County, at a place thirty miles from Liberty and to the north of Clay County. In this new county resides Mr. Mi[t]chel,[6] who, like Mr. Hughes, is the owner of a large tract of land there. The advantages they offer the Sisters are not to be despised. They allow them a piece of land of one hundred and sixty acres, well situated, well wooded, enriched with a number of springs and having on it a house ready for occupancy. To round off the good work it would be necessary, so I told them pleasantly, to guarantee the priest at least some forty acres, so that he may have something to dig and cultivate and thus contribute a little towards his own subsistence. The reasons I advanced in this connection appeared to them so just that they acquiesced without difficulty in my request. We have but a single Catholic family in this new county, Mr. Mi[t]chel's. According to Mr. Hughes many Catholic families are getting ready to emigrate from Kentucky and come to settle in Clinton County next spring. On the 10th I left Mr. Mi[t]chel and Mr. Hughes and returned to Liberty, where we have two Catholic families, those of Mr. Curtis and Mr. Riley (the two sons-in-law of Madame Benoist). I should very much like to see the religious establishment set up right in Liberty, for the population of the place is very considerable. It is estimated at 600; however, prejudice is too strong there against our religion. The time has not come for doing anything important in that place. On the 12th I went to Independence, Jackson County, 15 miles from Liberty and to the south of that little town. There I visited the two Roy families, the only Catholics we have in the place.[7] We have no hopes of seeing any more for the present, as prejudice against our belief is just as strong there as at Liberty. For all that, Monseigneur, I do not despair, *juvante Deo*, of gathering some fruit there, after I shall have carefully prepared some few instructions in English; ignorance of our religion among the inhabitants of both towns is, so to speak, crass.

On the 14th I bade good-bye to the two families and left for the French Village, New Ville [Vide?] Poche, 12 miles west of Independence.[8] I have been residing for some days with Mr. Guesseau Chouteau.[9] I disclosed to him all my intentions. Immediately he called a meeting of the Catholics of the locality to discuss means towards getting a church and supporting a priest. I found everybody well disposed and ready to make all reasonable sacrifices. It was agreed to guarantee the priest 40 acres of land to serve as a site for church and presbytery, besides furnishing a small tract for cultivation. I do not doubt for a moment of the success of this establishment, for the Messrs. Guesseau and Cyprian Chouteau are its two pillars and have it greatly at heart. Mr. Guesseau has engaged to levy on the purses of the Messrs.

---

[6] Father Roux subsequently spelt the name as Mitchell. In 1834, a sister of Mr. Mitchell was conducting a private school of some twenty pupils at Liberty, Mo.

[7] According to Canon O'Hanlon, author of the classic *Lives of the Irish Saints*, who as a young seminarian visited Independence in 1847, Mr. Thomas Davy, a Catholic whom he met there, had been resident in the place since 1824. Cf. O'Hanlon, *Life and Scenery in Missouri*, p. 132.

[8] *New Ville Poche* for *New Vide Poche*. *Vide Poche* (Empty Pocket) was the Creole nickname for Carondelet Village, now within the city limits of St. Louis. New Vide Poche was also an early name for Liberty, Clay Co., Mo. Cf. *Metropolitan Catholic Calendar*, 1834.

[9] Francis Gesseau (Jesse) Chouteau, grandson of Laclede, the founder of St. Louis, was the oldest of the five children of Jean Pierre Chouteau by the latter's second wife, Brigitte Saucier. He was born in St. Louis, February 27, 1797, but lived the greater part of his life in the place that has since become Kansas City, dying there in 1838. Francis Chouteau married Berenice, daughter of Pierre Menard of Kaskaskia. Madame Chouteau died in Kansas City, Nov. 19, 1888, at the age of eighty-seven years. Cf. Beckwith, *The Creoles of St. Louis*, p. 49; Mason, *Early Chicago and Illinois*, p. 148.

Chouteau of St. Louis and of Mr. Menard of Kaskaskia.[10] You see that the assistance of all these good and generous gentlemen will work no prejudice to the religious aims we have in view. We hope to have this establishment on foot by the end of June of next year and, if only my dear Mr. Bouvet were with me now, we should be enjoying it before that date. I want to get this place in a condition to receive some nuns before the end of next year. Such an institution out here would produce both in the immediate locality and in the neighborhood the most wonderful fruits to the great advantage of our Holy Religion. For this purpose I should need two nuns capable of teaching English and one for French and the other branches of education. If the community of the Ladies of the Sacred Heart would only consent to be party to the plan, you would find either at St. Louis or in Louisiana all the help I am looking for. I do not doubt, Monseigneur, that you will take some steps to second my design, which, so I hope, will redound to the great advantage of your diocese and of religion. So then, two new establishments or churches are as good as assured to us, one in Jackson County about two miles below the mouth of the Kansas River and the other in Clinton County 30 miles north of Liberty.

Up to this I have not exercised any functions of the ministry. No favorable opportunity for doing so has presented itself. Next week I will designate the place where I shall begin to exercise the priestly office. I have already announced at the meeting of the Catholics which I held that I would first baptize the babies, then would instruct those of the age of reason before baptizing them, would next have all well-disposed persons who so far have not enjoyed such happiness make their first Communion, after being prepared thereto, and in the last place would come to the men. These last words made them smile.

I am at present at the trading house of the Messrs. Chouteau, where I find myself quite comfortable.[11] Board, fire, lodging, everything is prepared for me with the greatest care. I cannot in this connection speak too highly in praise of Mr. Guesseau Chouteau and of his wife and brother. They show me the highest regard. But I do not expect to remain long with them, as they are right in the Indian country and too far away from the Catholics for me to carry on my ministry with convenience. I intend to go and settle in the midst of the French congregation; provided I have corn-bread and milk I am content. There are many things more I should like to tell you, but paper fails me. You will find them in the letters to Mr. Borgna and Mr. Lutz. You know, Monseigneur, my sincere attachment to you and my devotion to your diocese; deign to accept the respectful sentiments of one who is and will ever regard himself, Monseigneur, as

Your very humble and obedient servant,

Bt. Roux.

(*The following postscripts are written around the margins of Father Roux's four-page letter.*)

N.B. 1°. It is in Jackson County that we have most of our Catholics; still, their number there is very small. We have here only a dozen French families; but they

---

[10] Pierre Menard of Kaskaskia, Illinois, a foremost figure in the pioneer history of the state of Illinois and its first Lieutenant-Governor, 1818–1822. Cf. Moses, *Illinois, Historical and Statistical*, I, 289. Menard's statue stands before the east front of the capitol in the ground of the State-house at Springfield.

[11] This trading post was apparently the one built by the Chouteau brothers, Francis and Cyprian in 1825 on the south bank of the Kaw in the present Johnson County, Kansas. It stood in Section 13, township 11, range 24, east, about seven miles from the Missouri state-line. The Chouteaus were the most prominent of the early Indian traders in the region around the mouth of the Kaw. For data concerning the various Chouteau trading-houses, cf. *Kansas Historical Collections*, ix, pp. 573–574.

will keep me occupied for sometime, as there are many children to baptize and prepare for first Communion; the instructions will take up not a little of my time.

N.B. 2°. Everytime there has been question of a new establishment in your diocese you have always given a generous contribution towards its erection. It appears to me, Monseigneur, that I have some claim on your generosity, since we are here engaged in adding to your diocese two establishments which promise much for religion, whether as regards the Catholics, who are preparing to flock here in great numbers, or the Americans, who, with an opportunity for having regular instructions on our religion, would no doubt enter the bosom of the true church, or as regards, finally, the Indians, who would come to our church through curiosity and would be drawn in their own despite to embrace our religion. The two establishments are at the very door of the Indian country. I don't doubt for a moment that you will encourage them with material means.

N.B. 3°. The Kickapoo Prophet has two very docile sons, who, like their father, show themselves favorably inclined towards religion. If it were possible to have one of them taken at the Barrens so that he may make his religious studies there, it might be that God would call him to the priesthood. What mighty conquests for religion would then ensue! Concerning that nation I could tell you very many fine things which I have heard with my own ears and seen with my own eyes, for I recently made a trip of one short week to the Poos [Pottowatomies] and Kickapoos. I was received by them as an angel sent from heaven. Time does not permit me to inform you about the affair at present. It is enough to say to you that they are truly Catholics in desire and such Catholics in desire that their life gives you a perfect image of that of the Christians of the primitive church. We ought to pray for these two nations, for they are continually praying themselves for the Black-robes to come to their assistance and show them the way to Heaven. They pray every day, morning, night and before meals; they sanctify Sunday as we do and spend it entirely in prayer. They do not swear nor wage war nor lie nor have more than one wife; they believe in Heaven, Purgatory and Hell, honor the Blessed Virgin and Saints, etc. I should never finish were I to tell you all the edifying things I saw among them. Kindly answer me as to whether you retain jurisdiction over the Indians of the West, as in that case I would go to visit them from time to time.[12]

De la Rivière des Kans 20 Janvier 1834.

Monseigneur,

J'aurais reçu avec un plaisir indicible même la réponse la plus courte possible à la lettre que je vous ai écrite vers la fin de novembre de l'année qui vient de s'écouler, sans doute qu'elle ne vous sera pas arrivée, ou que vous êtes surchargé d'ouvrage: sans doute que celles que j'avais envoyées à MM. Borgna, Lutz, Bouvet, auront subi le même sort, seront restées en route, car je n'ai rien reçu d'eux. Enfin bref sur ce qui est passé. J'espère que celle—ci sera plus heureuse dans sa marche. Je suis arrivé ici dans une saison nullement propre à me favoriser dans mes entreprises. L'hiver me tient impitoyablement cerné en Mr. Chouteau's Trading house, à dix milles environ de la majeure partie des familles françaises, sans la moindre petite maison pour pouvoir nous y assembler et pour y célébrer les Sts. Mystères; Cependant un Américain, je dois vous le dire, m'a offert plusieurs fois sa maison à ce sujet; Je l'ai acceptée le

[12] The Kickapoo Village was in the immediate neighborhood of Fort Leavenworth, which was built on the right bank of the Missouri about twenty-five miles northwest of the site of Kansas City. Father Charles Van Quickenborne, S.J., opened in 1836 a mission among the Kickapoos, which was maintained only to 1840, when the missionaries were withdrawn owing to drunkenness among the Indians and the consequent poor prospects of fruitful missionary labor among the tribe.

Jour de Noël, mais je n'y ai pas dit la messe à cause des irrévérences que j'appréhendais de la part du peuple Américain *not acquainted at all with the holiest and most sublime action of our Religion.* Là revêtu de ma soutane, de mon surplis et de mon étole, j'ai prêché d'abord en français, car les catholiques des environs s'y étaient rendus avec empressement; ensuite, le croiriez vous, j'ai été assez présomptueux de prêcher en anglais, et de débuter par un sujet vraiment au dessus de ma capacité. Rien ne fait plus horreur, rien n'est plus révoltant que la Religion Catholique lorsqu'elle est mal entendue; au contraire rien n'est plus consolant, saint, sage, sublime que cette même religion lorsqu'elle est bien entendue; telles sont les deux propositions sur les quelles je leur ai parlé. Dieu a bien voulu seconder mes efforts. Ils m'ont tous écouté avec intérêt et avec la plus grande attention. Ils m'ont demandé quand je reprêcherais afin qu'ils pussent assister à nos assemblees, je leur ai répondu que l'hiver étant si rigoureux je ne pouvais pas leur désigner de jour, qu'ils entendraient dire quelques jours d'avance quand aurait lieu une autre assemblée catholique. Depuis ce temps là je ne suis plus retourné chez cet Américain qui m'a si bien reçu quoiqu'il n'appartienne point à notre Religion, Je ne crois pas que je prêche de nouveau chez lui, car comme il est grand amateur de bals, et qu'il a profité de notre assemblée de Noël pour en donner un le soir et le lendemain: Je ne voudrais pas lui fournir l'occasion de faire une chose contre laquelle je suis et serai toujours ouvertement déclaré. De sorte que je n'ai prêché qu'une fois depuis que j'ai quitté St. Louis. Je n'ai encore baptisé, préparé à la 1ère Communion, confessé personne. Je n'ai pas même eu jusqu'à présent le bonheur de dire la messe, soit parce que l'hiver est trop rigoureux et qu'il est impossible de voyager, soit parce que nous n'avons aucune maison pour nous assembler, etc., etc., etc. Laissons passer l'hiver, nous serons peut être plus heureux; ne cherchons pas à faire tout à la fois. *Pluribus intentus minor est ad singula sensus.* On ne transporta jamais en un jour une montagne de place.

Autant que je puis me le rappeler, Monseigneur, je vous marquai dans la première lettre que je vous écrivis,il y a près de trois mois, que les Français avaient intention d'assurer un terrain de 40 acres pour l'Eglise. Plusieurs Américains me temoignèrent leur désir d'entrer dans la coopération d'une oeuvre si avantageuse, me disaient-ils, au bien du pays, et m'observèrent en même temps qu'il faudrait former un Committé pour choisir une terre, un local convenable au but que l'on se proposait savoir d'élever une Eglise et de former deux établissements, l'un de soeurs pour l'éducation des jeunes demoiselles du pays, et l'autre pour les garçons; Aussitot dit aussitot fait le Committé est formé, on choisi au lieu de 40, 80 acres de terre. On en aurait passé la vente ou en faveur de vous, Monseigneur, ou à la mienne, avec la seule condition que si l'un ou l'autre de ces établissements ne réussissait pas que le terrain reviendrait à quatre membres désignés du Committé, condition que je n'ai point encore approuvée et que je n'approuverai jamais, car je suis loin de me rendre l'esclave de personne en ce genre là. Cependant si je puis les déterminer à la lever, je me fixerai sur l'endroit choisi. Si j'avais à présent mon Monsieur Bouvet je serais sûr de réussir avec lui seul, sans l'assistance d'aucune autre personne, si non en grand du moins en petit.

Si vous pouviez m'obtenir des Dames du Sacré-Coeur, trois, deux américaines et une française; elles seraient capables de faire ici plus de bien qu'un prêtre, quoiqu'un prêtre trouvera abondament de l'ouvrage; ou des Soeurs de la Charité s'il n'y a aucune espérance d'avoir des premières; croyez que vous m'obligeriez grandement, si vous pouviez me donner quelque réponse la dessus le première fois que vous m'écrirez. J'en serais bien aise, car je prendrais dès-à présent quelques précautions pour les recevoir au moins un peu convenablement.

Je n'ai encore point reçu d'ordo, mes Gazettes, veuillez charger Mr. Borgna de m'expédier ces articles, et l'assurer de mes amitiés ainsi que MM. Lutz et Tuker [Tucker]. Croyez, Monseigneur, que je suis toujours avec la plus parfaite considération.

Votre très humble et très obéissant serviteur

B. Roux.

P.S. Si toutefois vous ne saviez pas mon adresse la voici

Rev. Benedict Roux

Shawnee Post-office, Jackson County, Mo.

Je suis confus vraiment de vous envoyer une lettre si négligée, mais ma mauvaise encre et un froid insupportable en sont la cause. Je me porte bien.

(*Translation*)

From the Kansas River, January 20, 1834.

Monseigneur,

I would have received with unspeakable pleasure even the briefest possible answer to the letter I wrote you towards the end of November of the past year. No doubt it must have failed to reach you or else you are overwhelmed with work. No doubt, too, the letters sent to Messrs Borgna, Lutz and Bouvet must have met with the same fate and been stopped on the way; for I have not had a word from those persons. I need not delay on what has taken place. I hope this letter will be more fortunate in reaching its destination. I came here at a season by no means favorable to my plans. The winter holds me pitilessly confined in Mr. Chouteau's Trading-house, about ten miles from the majority of the French families, without the least little house where we can meet and celebrate the Holy Mysteries. However, an American, I must tell you, several times offered me his house for the purpose. I accepted it for Christmas day, but did not say Mass in view of the irreverence I feared on the part of the Americans, "not acquainted at all with the holiest and most sublime action of our Religion." There, vested in my soutane, surplice and stole I preached first in French, for the Catholics of the neighborhood had eagerly gathered at the place; then, would you believe it, I was presumptuous enough to preach in English and to start off with a subject really beyond my capacity. Nothing excites more horror, nothing is more revolting than the Catholic religion, when ill understood; on the contrary, nothing is more consoling, holy, wise and sublime than this same religion when well understood. Such were the two propositions on which I spoke to them. God was indeed pleased to bless my efforts. They all listened to me with interest and with the greatest attention. They asked me when I would preach again, so that they might attend our meetings. I told them that as the winter was so severe, I could not fix on any particular day, but that they would hear a few days in advance when another Catholic meeting was to take place. Since then I have not gone back to the American who received me so kindly, although he does not belong to our religion. I do not think I shall preach any more at his house as he is a great lover of balls and took advantage of our Christmas meeting to give one in the evening and another the day after. I do not care to furnish him an occasion of doing a thing against which I have openly declared and will continue ever so to do. As a consequence, I have preached only once since I left St. Louis. I have baptized nobody, prepared nobody for first Communion, heard nobody's confession. I have not had had the happiness even of saying Mass, either because the winter is too severe and it is impossible to travel or because we have no house where we can meet, etc., etc. Only let the winter pass and we shall perhaps

have better luck. Don't let us try to do everything at once. *Pluribus intentus minor est ad singula sensus.* No one ever moved a mountain from its place in a day.

As far as I can recall, Monseigneur, I mentioned in the first letter I wrote to you almost three months ago that the French had the intention of guaranteeing a tract of 40 acres for a church. A number of Americans declared to me their desire of cooperating in a work so advantageous, as they tell me, to the good of the locality, advising me at the same time that it would be necessary to organize a committee to select a piece of land and a site suitable for the object we have in view, which is to build a church and form two establishments, one of Sisters for the education of the young ladies of the locality and the other for the boys. No sooner said than done. A committee has been organized and instead of 40, 80 acres of land have been picked out. They would have made over the deed of sale to you, Monseigneur, or to myself on the sole condition that if one or the other of the two establishments should not succeed, the property would revert to the four designated members of the committee, a condition which I have not yet approved and shall never approve, for I am far from rendering myself the slave of any one in a matter of this kind. However, if I can prevail upon them to waive this condition, I shall settle down on the site selected.[13] If I only had my Mr. Bouvet now, I should be sure of succeeding with him alone and without anybody else's assistance, if not on a large scale, at least on a small one.[14]

If you could get me some Ladies of the Sacred Heart, two Americans and one French, they would be able to do more good here than a priest; although a priest will find plenty of work; or else some Sisters of Charity, if there is no hope of having the first. Believe me, I should be greatly obliged to you could you give me an answer on this subject the next time you write to me. It would put me at ease, for I would at once begin to prepare to give them at least something like a suitable reception.

I have not yet received either Ordo or newspapers; kindly commission Mr. Borgna to forward me these articles, and assure him, as also Messrs. Lutz and Tucker of my kind regards. Believe, Monseigneur, that I am ever with the most perfect consideration,

Your very humble and obedient servant,
B. Roux.

P. S. If you are still without knowledge of my address, here it is

Rev. Benedict Roux,
Shawnee Post Office, Jackson Co., Mo.

It is really embarrassing for me to send you so untidy a letter, but bad ink and the insufferable cold are the cause of it. I am feeling well.

---

[13] Father Roux's negotiations for a church-site culminated in his purchase from Pierre La Liberté, April 5, 1834, of a tract of forty acres, the consideration being only six dollars. This tract was disposed of by Father Roux October 20, 1838, to Francis Mumblo, for $700, "except ten acres in a square, on the center of which a log church and a log house are put up." These ten acres, bounded by Eleventh, Twelfth, Broadway and a line one hundred feet west of Jefferson street, were deeded over to Bishop Rosati by Father Roux, January 31, 1839. Cf. Catholic Historical Review, October, 1917, p. 331; *Encyclopaedia of the History of Missouri*, i, 540.

[14] Mr. Bouvet, a layman of St. Louis, joined Father Roux at the Kansas River about the middle of 1834. He there discharged the duties of factotum and general lay assistant to the Father, often accompanying the latter on his missionary trips to Clay and Clinton counties.

De la Rivière des Kans, 11 Mars 1834.

Monseigneur,

J'ai reçu le sept de ce mois trois lettres, l'une de vous, l'autre de Mr. Bouvet, et la troisième de Mde. Duchesne. La vôtre et celle de Mr. Bouvet ont grandement réjoui mon coeur, mais celle des Dames du Sacré-Coeur n'a nullement répondu à mon attente. Adressons nous aux bonnes Soeurs de la Charité, elles se confient en Dieu dans les entreprises, et volent au moindre signe au secours de ceux qui sollicitent leur assistance. Votre long silence, Monseigneur, avait déjà fait naître dans mon esprit des idées bien sombres, mais votre agréable et consolante lettre les a entièrement dissipées. Les témoignages d'affection et de confiance que vous m'y montrez sont pour moi un vif encouragement pour resserrer de plus en plus les noeuds d'estime et d'attachement qui m'unissent, non sans gloire, à Votre Grandeur, et pour me sacrifier, s'il le faut, pour l'intérêt de votre diocèse, car j'ai intention de faire le bien afin de m'assurer dans le ciel ce trésor que *neque aerugo neque tinea demolitur, neque fures fodiunt nec furantur.* Trop heureux si Dieu veut se servir de moi comme un instrument pour coopérer au salut de quelques âmes!

Vous désirez, Monseigneur, que je vous donne quelques nouvelles. Je puis en effet vous en communiquer, car j'en ai une certaine provision; Quelques unes, peut-être ne seront pas de votre goût, mais la plupart au moins vous feront plaisir: Je n'ai pas encore eu le bonheur de dire la messe depuis que j'ai quitté St. Louis; croyez que c'est une grande privation pour moi. La raison est que les quatre premiers mois je n'avais pas la moindre petite place décente pour une action aussi auguste, aussi sainte. Mais depuis un mois et demi cette excuse n'est plus, car grâce à la famille Chouteau qui m'a prodigué mille soins, nous avons choisi et arrangé très décemment une maison pour cette fin, à laquelle maison deux autres sont annexées pour servir de presbytère au prêtre. La congrégation catholique les a louées pour un an. En attendant la Providence je l'espère, nous fournira quelques moyens pour exécuter un plan un peu moins resserré. Cette excuse a fait place à une autre, La congrégation catholique se trouvant éloignée de plusieurs milles de notre petite chapelle, Je suis obligé de les attendre souvent jusqu'à midi; et moi-même pour m'y rendre je suis obligé de faire dix grands milles; ma demeure est sur la terre des sauvages, chez Mr. Chouteau. Il est vrai que je pars le samedi du lieu de mon habitation, mais arrivé à mon presbytèire je n'y trouve ni déjeuner, ni diner, ni souper ni feu, un vieux matelas, un drap, deux couvertures, un oreiller rèhaussé par un gros rouleau de bois, voilà ma couche. Si je veux manger, il faut que j'aille quêter ma nourriture, souvent à plusieurs milles de là. La faim donne un assaisonnement à tout, quelque grossier que soit le mets. Impossible donc de pouvoir dire la messe n'étant soigné de personne, La santé la plus robuste y faillirait en peu de semaines. Samedi dernier cependant je fis promettee à une respectable veuve de me préparer mes repas, lui faisant entendre que la congrégation catholique la défraiyerait des dépenses que je lui occasionnerais. Rien de plus juste, car *dignus est operarius cibo suo.* J'espère dire la messe dans quelques jours, mais je ne la dirai publiquement que le jour de Pâques, et alors je continuerai régulièrment tous les dimanches et même tous les jours si je puis avoir ce bonheur; car alors je crois que j'aurai le plaisir d'avoir Mr. Bouvet avec moi. J'ai commencé à tenir nos assemblées le dimanche de la sexagesime,[8] je n'ai point discontinué de les tenir régulièrement tous les dimanches jusqu'à présent. J'ai le plaisir d'y voir beaucoup d'américains qui écoutent avec la plus grande patience mon pauvre anglais; je prêche en français et anglais tous les dimanches, Je fais aussi le catéchisme en français et anglais tous les dimanches, Des cantiques dans les deux langues commencent à s'y chanter régulièrment. Le 23

de février je baptisai douze enfans; j'y mis toute la pompe et la solennité possibles, afin d'en inspirer aux Protestans et de les amener à notre Ste. Religion par quelques moyens séduisants. A cet effet je fis décorer ma trop petite chapelle de mon mieux; un très joli petit autel fut élevé avec une élégance mignonne; quatre chandeliers brillans comme de l'or furent allumés pendant toute la cérémonie; la croix que j'ai hérité du défunt Mr. Leclère était placée de manière à frapper avantageusement l'oeil du protestant; un dôme fait avec un goût exquis était dressé au dessus de l'autel. Quatre petits enfans de choeur très proprement habillés m'assistèrent dans cette cérémonie. L'exercice fut ouvert par le chant d'un cantique en francais *O Saint Esprit* etc., ensuite par celui d'un cantique en anglais *Spirit Creator of Mankind* etc. Je prêchai en français sur *la nécessité du baptême* et en anglais *On the meaning of the ceremonies of Baptism*. J'avais prêché en anglais le dimanche précédent sur la nécessité de recevoir je baptême pour toute personne, même pour les enfans. Deux semaines après je prêchai en anglais sur les effects du baptême. Les deux sermons étant fini je procédai à l'administration du baptême. Tout le monde américain ne put pas satisfaire sa curiosité, car notre chapelle était pour ainsi dire plus que pleine. Après l'administration du baptême on chanta en français le cantique *Bénissons à Jamais* etc. Et les americains que j'avais formés chantèrent le cantique en anglais *Hail Heavenly Queen* etc. Tout le monde à ce qu'on me dit se retira enchanté et pleinement satisfait. Quoique nous n'ayons ici aucune famille américaine catholique, j'espère qu'avant long-temps si Dieu veut bien bénir mes entreprises, nous en aurons quelques unes; Car plusieurs depuis cette cérémonie veulent se faire baptiser dans la religion catholique; plusieurs se font un plaisir de me prêter leur voix pour exécuter nos chants religieux; plusieurs me demandent des livres catholiques pour se former une idée de notre religion. Que n'ai-je une douzaine ou deux de catéchismes en anglais, l'oeuvre de Dieu serait bien plutôt accélérée. Mais je suis dans l'impossibilité de faire la moindre dépense car je suis condamné pour plusieurs années à ne pas retirer peut-être un *cent;* toutes les familles françaises, à l'exception de celle de Mr. Chouteau, sont dans un état de détresse qui les rend incapables de pouvoir me supporter. Quand il faut faire peser le fardeau sur un seul, vous le savez, on en est bientôt fatigué. Si l'Association de la propagation de la foi pouvait jetter quelques regards de compassion sur le prêtre de la Rivière des Kans, elle le mettrait à même avec quelques secours pécuniaires, de faire fleurir la religion catholique dans ces contrées-ci, et d'ouvrir la porte à la plus belle mission chez les Indiens, car tous sont très bien en faveur des Robes Noires. Je me propose dans quelque temps de lui écrire à ce sujet; ce sera pour la premiere fois. Pour vous, Monseigneur, je ne doute pas un instant que vous effectuerez la promesse que vous m'avez faite de vous intéresser spécialement pour cette mission du haut du Missouri. J'ai encore une douzaine d'autres personnes à baptiser. La plupart sont de jeunes gens et de jeunes personnes que j'instruis et prépare—à la fois pour le baptême et pour la 1ère. Communion. Je renvoie cette cérémonie à Pâques; j'ai à coeur de la rendre la plus solennelle et la plus pompeuse que je pourrai; nous devons mettre tout en oeuvre pour procurer la plus grande gloire de Dieu. Je m'occupe maintenant des grandes personnes. Je réfléchis, je rumine comment je pourrai les amener à la confession; le pas est très glissant. Pour ne pas exaspérer personne je cherche à mettre en pratique le conseil de notre grand modèle; *Estote prudentes sicut serpentes et simplices sicut columbae.* Plusieurs déjà, à ma satisfaction, se sont présentés au St. tribunal de la pénitence; cependant beaucoup d'hommes resteront en arrière, quoiqu'ils le soient déjá grandement; ne cessons toutefois de semer, planter et arroser, Celui qui est en Haut y donnera l'accroissement, lorsqu'il le jugera à propos.

(*Translation*)

From the Kansas River, March 11, 1834.

Monseigneur,

I received on the seventh of this month three letters, one from yourself, one from Mr. Bouvet and the third from Madame Duchesne.[15] Your own and Mr. Bouvet's cheered me greatly; but the one from the Ladies of the Sacret Heart in no wise came up to my expectations. Let us address ourselves to the good Sisters of Charity; they trust in God in all their undertakings and fly at the least sign to the relief of those who solicit their aid.[16] Your long silence, Monseigneur, had already started some very gloomy reflections in my soul, but your pleasant and consoling letter has dissipated them entirely. The tokens of affection and confidence in my regard which you manifest therein encourage me greatly to fasten ever tighter the ties of esteem and attachment which bind me not without glory to your Lordship and to sacrifice myself, if need be, for the interests of your diocese; for I cherish the intention to do good so as to assure myself that treasure in heaven which *neque aerugo neque tinea demolitur nec fures fodiunt nec furantur.* I should be only too happy were God to be pleased to employ me as an instrument for coöperating in the salvation of a few souls.

You wish me, Monseigneur, to send you some news. This, in effect, I can do, for I have a certain stock of news on hand. Some of it, perhaps, will not be to your taste, but the bulk of it at least will afford you pleasure. I have not yet had the happiness of saying Mass since I left St. Louis. Believe me, this is a great privation. The reason is that for the first four months I did not have the least little place respectable enough for an action so august and holy. But for the last month and a half this excuse holds no longer, as thanks to the Chouteau family, who lavish a thousand cares on me, we have chosen and arranged very decently a house for this purpose, to which house two others are attached to serve as presbytery for the priest.[17] The Catholic congregation has rented them for a year. Meantime Providence, so I hope, will furnish means to enable us to carry things out on a somewhat less restricted plan. This excuse has given place to another. As the Catholic congregation find themselves at a distance of several miles from our little chapel, I am obliged to wait for them often up to mid-day, while to get to my destination I must myself cover ten long miles. My place of residence is with Mr. Chouteau in the Indian territory. It is true that I leave my lodging place on Saturday; but on reaching my presbytery, I find there neither breakfast, dinner, supper nor fire. An old mattress, a sheet, blankets, a pillow raised on a large wooden support—such is my bed. If I want to eat, I must go in search of food, often several miles away. Hunger gives a seasoning to everything however coarse the dish. It is impossible, then, to say Mass. Not being taken care of by anybody, the most robust health would

[15] Madame Philippine-Rose Duchesne opened the first house of the Ladies of the Sacred Heart in the United States at St. Charles, Mo. in 1818. The cause of her beatification has been introduced.

[16] The Mother Seton Sisters of Charity established in St. Louis since 1828, when they opened Mullanphy Hospital. A tender from Bishop Rosati to Father Roux of some French-speaking Sisters of St. Joseph was declined by the Father, November, 1834, on the ground that the Sisters, not knowing English, could not do the work expected of them, but especially on the ground that no means of material support could be provided for them. Father Roux was disillusioned, recognizing and frankly admitting that his project of a Sisters' school on the Missouri frontier was premature.

[17] Father Roux conducted services in this rented house up to his return to St. Louis in April, 1835. The house is said to have stood near the intersection of Second and Cherry streets. The Chouteau family were not only instrumental in securing the rented church, but defrayed half the expense of erection of the log church built on the property purchased by Father Roux. For a period of three years the first church of Kansas City continued to be designated in the Baptismal Records of the Kickapoo Mission simply as "Chouteau's Church."

fail there in a few weeks. Last Saturday, however, I made a respectable widow promise to prepare my meals, giving her to understand that the Catholic congregation would defray whatever expense I should put her to. Nothing more just, for *dignus est operarius cibo suo.* I hope to say Mass in a few days, but I will not say it in public until Easter day. After that I will keep it up regularly every Sunday and even every day, if I can have this happiness; for I expect by that time I shall have the pleasure of seeing Mr. Bouvet with me.

I began to hold meetings Sexagesima Sunday, and have not failed to have them regularly every Sunday up to the present,[18] I have the pleasure of seeing many Americans present; they listen with the greatest patience to my poor English. I preach in French and English every Sunday. Hymns in the two languages are now beginning to be sung regularly. On February 23, I baptized twelve children, doing it with all the pomp and solemnity possible so as to inspire the Protestants thereby and draw them by such attractions to our Holy Religion.[19] With this end in view I had my chapel, which is quite too small, decorated the best way possible. A very pretty little altar was set up with a touch of dainty elegance, while four chandeliers as bright as gold were lit during the entire ceremony. The crucifix, which I inherited from the late Mr. Leclere (?), was placed in a position where it would meet the eye of the Protestant with advantage, while a dome made with exquisite taste was raised above the altar. Four little choir-children very suitably attired assisted me at the ceremony. The services opened with the singing of a French hymn, *O Saint Esprit, etc.* Then followed an English hymn, *Spirit, Creator of Mankind, etc.* I preached in French on *the necessity of baptism* and in English *on the meaning of the ceremonies of Baptism.* I had preached in English the Sunday before on the necessity of receiving baptism in the case of all persons, even infants. Two weeks later I preached in English on the effects of baptism. The two sermons over, I proceeded to administer Baptism. The Americans present could not all satisfy their curiosity, for our little chapel was, so to speak, more than full. After the administration of Baptism, we sang a French hymn, *Bénissons à jamais,* etc., etc., and the Americans, whom I had trained, sang a hymn in English, *Hail Heavenly Queen,* etc., etc. From what was told me, everybody went away charmed and fully satisfied. Though we have no American Catholic family here, I hope to have some before long, should God be pleased to bless my undertaking; for several persons since that ceremony wish to be baptized in the Catholic religion. Several of them are pleased to help with their voices in the singing of our religious hymns, while others ask me for Catholic books that they may get some idea of our religion. If I only had a dozen or two catechisms in English, God's work would speed along more quickly. But I am in a position where it is impossible to incur even the least expense, seeing that I am reduced to the necessity for many years to come of not collecting even a penny. All the French families, with the exception of Mr. Chouteau's, are in a state of distress which renders them incapable of providing for my support. When the whole burden is placed on the shoulders of a single individual, you know well enough that he will soon grow tired of it. If the Association for the Propagation of the Faith were only to cast a few glances of compassion on the priest of the Kansas River, it could with a little pecuniary aid, put him in a position to make the Catholic Religion

[18] February 2, 1834.

[19] The names of the first four children baptized on this occasion were Martha Roy, Adeline Prudhomme, Martha Lessert and Amelia Roy. On March 15, 1834, Father Roux baptized Elizabeth Boone and on April 19, 1835, Eulalia Boone, both daughters of Daniel Morgan Boone, son of the historic Missouri pioneer, Daniel Boone.

flourish in these parts and open the door to the finest of Indian missions, for all the Indians are in favor of the Black Robes. I propose to write sometime to the Association on this matter; it will be for the first time. As for yourself, Monseigneur, I don't doubt for a moment that you will redeem the pledge you gave me to interest yourself in a special manner in this mission of Upper Missouri. I have still a dozen other persons to baptize. Most of them are young girls and boys, whom I am instructing and preparing for Baptism and First Communion together. This ceremony I defer until Easter. My intention is to give it all the pomp and solemnity that will be possible. We should exert every effort to procure the greater glory of God. I am occupying myself just now with the adults. I reflect, I ponder how I shall be able to bring them to confession; it is very slippery ground. Not to exasperate anybody, I try to put into practice the counsel of our great Model, *estote prudentes sicut serpentes et simplices sicut columbae.* To my great satisfaction several have already presented themselves at the Sacred Tribunal of penance; still, many of the men will continue to be backward in their duties, though they are already very long in that condition. However, let us not cease to sow, plant and water; He who is above will give the increase at the time He will see fit.

(*The remainder of this letter, as not dealing with Father Roux's Kansas City Mission, is here omitted.*)

The Roux Letters are a typical instance of the great mass of unpublished historical material in the Historical Archives of the Archdiocese of St. Louis. This material consists largely of letters and reports belonging for the most part to the period of Bishop Rosati's incumbency of the See of St. Louis (1826–1843). Written without thought of publication and often with great fullness of detail and graphic power of pen by priests and prelates intimately identified with the pioneer beginnings of Catholicity in the Middle West, these letters constitute a unique and invaluable source of original material for an authentic history of the Catholic Church in that section of the United States. It is gratifying to be able to note that they have already been laid under contribution by Reverend Francis Holweck in the scholarly series of sketches of early Missouri priests now appearing in the pages of the Saint Louis *Pastoral-Blatt* and by Reverend Dr. Souvay in his illuminating firsthand studies on Bishops Du Bourg and Rosati, which have appeared in the REVIEW. It is to be hoped that these and other members of the St. Louis Catholic Historical Society will continue to work the rich deposit of documentary material at hand to them in the Historical Archives of the Archdiocese of St. Louis, thus paving the way, through a series of scholarly monographs on special topics, for a thoroughly reliable general history of the Catholic Church in the extensive territory of which St. Louis was the ecclesiastical metropolis through a long and memorable period of years.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Mississippi Valley in British Politics. A Study of the Trade, Land Speculation, and Experiments in Imperialism culminating in the American Revolution by Clarence Walworth Alvord. Cleveland, U. S. A.: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1917. Two vols., pp. 358+396, including maps and bibliography.

In the preface to these fine volumes the author disclaims any purpose of preparing a systematic narrative of the events preceding the American Revolution. That is, he does not intend to enumerate with catalogued completeness the happenings which antedated and occasioned that struggle. So far gone in heresy is Doctor Alvord that he omits the time-honored descriptions of the Boston "massacre" and the Boston tea party. For an account of these incidents in the epic the disappointed reader must consult the pages of the older school histories of the United States. Those who belong to the generation just preceding that of the author's boyhood will miss, at this point, the theatrical speech and tragic mien of that youthful leader who complained to a British officer that his soldier's had wantonly broken down the children's snow-hills. To our young mind it was always much of a mystery how in far-off England the King's ministers could know that a gentle incline slopes down from Beacon Street to the Common and of what possible advantage it could be to put to flight the pleasures of youth. But, after all, was our insight into the springs of history so far inferior to that of many an early chronicler who was persuaded that the muse of research pursued him with a message?

Though Professor Alvord's theme lies to a great extent in the West, he does not intend to write of that romantic section. He modestly claims for his inquiries no greater value than the subordinate merit of assisting later historians to discover the connection between the Mississippi valley and British politics. As will presently appear, he has done far more, for it does not require much skill in the art of divination to foretell that his footprints will be tracked through moor and fell to the main stream of history. He has himself made that discovery.

Correctly assuming that a satisfactory explanation of the

beginnings of our Republic can be gained by only a thorough study of the annals of contemporary England, the author has fixed his attention on the rapid succession of eighteenth century ministries, hoping in those political caldrons, where boiled and bubbled "eye of newt and toe of frog," to perceive in germinal state a governmental policy for the West. In disposing of that section the regulating principle of the government appears to have been identical with the interest of a faction.

"Your people are fools," wrote Frederick the Great to the Marquis d'Argens, "you are going to lose your Canada and Pondicherry to please the Queen of Hungary and the Czarina." The treaty of Paris (1763) proved the truth of the Prince's prophecy, for British arms had won not only Canada and the Coromandel coast but Louisiana. How were the victors going to dispose of the conquered colonies and the dependencies of France? The dozen years that passed before Lexington did not suffice for an answer. In the opinion of Doctor Alvord the hesitant attempts to solve this problem were not unconnected with the American Revolution, which, indeed, in any scientific view is to be regarded as but an event, though a major one, in the development of the constitution of England. Relative to America the situation was as obscure as the house of night and the voices within reported little harmony. The task of the author is to interpret those discrepant sounds. Looking into the future, from the date of the treaty of Paris, he perceives the dim outlines of the Stamp Act, the meeting of the Congress to consider which may be regarded as the beginning of the American state, of the Townshend Acts, and the Quebec Act, the last on the eve of Lexington and Concord. In his view these tentative plans for the organization of the West formed "the warp and woof of British imperial policy."

An epigram of Pitt introduces this valuable work. He declared: "Some are for keeping Canada; some Guadaloupe;" and he inquired, "who will tell me which I shall be hanged for not keeping?" The statesman had before him a legislature composed of persons in search of such merchandise as in vision the Pilgrim beheld at Vanity Fair. There, in the flesh, were men who would purchase "houses, lands, trades, places, honours, preferments, titles, countries, kingdoms, lusts, pleasures, and

delights of all sorts, . . . They that kept the fair, Bunyan is careful to remind his readers, "were the men of this world," the children of wrath.

For England, as the reviewer has stated in a notice of Trevelyan's *American Revolution*, "the conclusion of peace was only less expensive than the conduct of the late campaign, because the approval of a venal Parliament was secured by only the most lavish distribution of public money. The business of bribery was managed without observing even a pretence of secrecy. Members of the House of Commons flocked to the Pay Office, in which a shop had been publicly opened for their purchase. Bank-bills as low as two hundred pounds were exchanged for the promise of a vote, and in a single morning there was issued the sum of £25,000. Thus was effected the chief event of Bute's brief ministry, and to the integrity and virtue of such legislators were committed the great and varied interests of an empire."

Pitt's policy was far from being intricate. His object was so to depress the power of France that she could never again in commerce or in colonizing become a formidable rival of England. But in France was the Duc de Choiseul, who saw not less clearly than Pitt, and who began so to organize the resources of his country that in favorable circumstances he could dismember the proud empire of Britain. Professor Alvord has taken for the subject of his interesting inquiry the trade, the land speculation, and the experiments in imperialism between 1763 and 1775.

In the course of the eighteenth century, says the author, "Whiggism became a necessary attribute of aspirants for political honors." But the history of that era is not, as was formerly believed, to be understood by assuming what did not exist, namely, a rivalry between Whig and Tory. For a generation the arrogance and the genius of Pitt had put an end to party government, but when parties disappeared, factions marked by inconstancy sprang up and by banding together ruled the empire for their own advancement. Of these groups the Old Whigs seem to have been the strongest. The popular estimate of them suffered nothing from the fact that their spokesman was Edmund Burke, a master of universal erudition, a man of lofty patriotism, and one of the greatest writers of English prose.

Another strong faction was made up of the dependents of the Crown. More constant to their principles were the followers of William Pitt, a party which included some of the foremost men in England. Another important unit was that composed of the Scottish representatives, who prospered by the gifts of the Crown, which they unanimously supported. Dr. Alvord describes many other groups. Together these factions embarrassed the early years of the King, though in time he shaped matters more to his liking.

With the background suggested by the preceding paragraphs the author begins his narrative. The value of Prussian assistance to England during the Seven Years' War he fails to emphasize. Even though that contest belongs chiefly to European history the services of Frederick should have been noticed. On this subject the ideas of most Americans, of even many of those who will read Professor Alvord's book, have been formed by the school histories, and these clearly convey the impression that England and her colonies defeated France and her feeble New World settlements. But anything which in Europe gave employment to French soldiers was an undoubted advantage to England. Without British subsidies, indeed, the power of Frederick must have been destroyed, but he repaid that service and had a share in driving France from North America, nor could the aid of Spanish ships and Spanish treasure avert disaster to her arms.

In considering their North American conquests British statesmen regarded as of little value those Northern provinces which produced commodities similar to those of England. As potential rivals, therefore, the flow of population thither was to be discouraged, while the development of the Southern colonies with their non-English staples was to be fostered. But not every faction held these opinions. Franklin as well as his friend Richard Jackson, colonial agent of Pennsylvania, espousing the cause of the King, advised the retention of Canada and asserted that there was no danger of the colonies declaring their independence, for mutual jealousies would retard or altogether prevent separation. When victory was assured, there sprang up between pamphleteers an animated warfare as to whether Canada or Guadaloupe was the more important. While some em-

phasized the worth of Canada, there were others who argued for the retention of Louisiana. Though it is true that Englishmen generally, even intelligent ones, knew little of the physical features or of the resources of their late conquests, the Lords of Trade and Plantations had without doubt received from colonial governors and their deputies much information concerning the trans-Alleghany region, its people, and its products. It is entirely probable that when such papers were received in England they were not often published. A digest of these communications, which is to be found in the Library of the Pennsylvania Historical Society, in Philadelphia, extends to more than a score of beautiful manuscript volumes. It is greatly to be regretted that copies of so valuable a work have not been multiplied.

The moneyed classes, says the author, were keenly interested in the exploitation of the wilderness. They, it appears, had a pecuniary rather than a patriotic interest in the boundless acquisitions of the Seven Years' War. Land speculation and the trade in furs soon became general. The Ohio Company with its immense holdings was early in the field. Before a dozen years had passed the Loyal Company received from North Carolina a grant that in extent was vast. In the course of the war military enthusiasm had been stimulated by the offer to deserving soldiers of generous grants of land. Indeed so keen was competition that rival companies sometimes allied themselves with the Indians. Franklin and others proposed the establishment in the West of two or more barrier colonies, while Samuel Hazard, a Philadelphia merchant, modestly named himself as the lord proprietor of an extensive colony to be settled by Protestants, but death wrecked his plans for the founding of that orthodox settlement. Colonel George Washington championed the cause of his soldiers, who, by a proclamation of Governor Dinwiddie, were promised Western lands. Among the new associations were the Mississippi Company, the New Wales Colony, and Charlotina. Colonel Bouquet would protect the settlements by the establishment of a military frontier. But, on the whole, Englishmen took little interest in those ephemeral projects.

In treating the early Western policy of Great Britain, Professor Alvord says that the wisest legislation could not have avoided the clash between the white man and the Indian. Among

the actors in this historical drama he does not purpose to distribute praise or blame, his plan being merely to explain the motives of those characters who wrangled for a part in the tragedy. Of those vanished actors gold had ruled in many a hireling heart. It appears as if some felon spirit of a distant past had condemned the Indian to lose both his hunting grounds and cornfields. For a season, it is true, he was suffered to live amongst familiar streams and forests only in a little while to resume his journey toward the setting sun in which, perhaps unfeelingly, he read his doom. We do not perfectly agree with Doctor Alvord, for we believe that relations with the Indians could have been more wisely arranged.

Obstacles, apparently insurmountable, confronted ministries in the epoch between 1748 and 1774. Statesmen of that era were compelled amidst mighty forces to tread a winding way. There were "Indian rights, fur-trading companies, frontier settlers, rival land companies, imperial interests, colonial charters" as well as powerful forces inherent in the Western domain. To evoke from such interests anything like harmony required the inspiration of genius. Though uniformity in dealing with the aboriginal races had been recommended by earlier colonial officials, before 1748 no Western policy had been formulated. In that situation the colonies were free to develop different systems. Doubtless under each the Indian suffered.

Men of large fortune, whether in England or the colonies, who had made considerable investments in land east of the mountains did not favor westward expansion. The author gives a list of those who were large holders in East Florida. In extent their tracts ranged from 5,000 to 40,000 acres, the Earls of Beresford and Dartmouth having been among the principal investors. These were naturally opposed to any westward expansion, for in that case their lands situated east of the mountains would be certain to depreciate in value. There was another class whose sense of justice was opposed to allowing frontiersmen to swarm without restraint over lands which had long been the home of the native races. In this view was concerned conscience as well as patriotism, for the empire would be unfavorably affected by Indian wars. Therefore this group advocated conciliation of the natives.

Besides the question of occupying the lands of the Indians there was that concerning trade, a problem bristling with difficulties. Should traffic with the tribes be regulated by colonial or by imperial authority? Attempts at the settlement of this question produced two plans, namely, the imperial and the anti-imperial. Under the existing system the Indians had been defrauded of their lands and cheated in trade. Their better treatment by the French inclined the natives to that people. In what manner this condition could be changed by the colonists had been pointed out to the Lords of Trade at least as early as 1721. But that recommendation appears to have aroused no interest.

Though the colonists were responsible for much of the trouble with the aboriginal races, they made but indifferent exertions to defend themselves from the resentment of their victims, the mother country having been forced to come to their assistance. In such circumstances she was not unreasonable in expecting the colonies to support a commissary general or superintendent of Indian affairs. Her object was to put an end to the encroachment of the French on territory claimed by the English.

British statesmen were more abundantly supplied with information when William Johnson, afterward knighted, was appointed overseer of the northern, and, by the death of the original appointee, John Stuart became overseer of the southern Indians. The report prepared by Wraxall, Johnson's secretary, greatly influenced subsequent policy. It recommended that relative to their complaints concerning lands satisfaction be made the Indians, and that future patents be granted for only such tracts as were bought in the presence of the superintendents.

Pennsylvania promised, by a treaty made in 1758 at Easton, that within its limits no settlements would be made beyond the mountains. Though this example was not without influence, the principle was not yet extended by the ministry to the other colonies. In future settlements the rights of the Indians to their lands were not to be disregarded. Under Lord Halifax the Board of Trade had imperialized the political control of Indian affairs. The purchase of their lands, too, was gradually withdrawn from the colonies and assumed by the Government. But whatever regulations were made during the course of the

war were generally believed to be no more than temporary arrangements.

At that time it was resolved to keep in America a military force to protect the country, especially the new acquisitions, against invasion and from those Indians who were pro-French in sympathy; also to hold in check the new subjects in Canada, Louisiana, and the Floridas. When the government called for a detailed statement of the necessary troops and fortifications, the governor of Montreal suggested that small garrisons be maintained at certain posts and that officers be vested with judicial authority. It was a measure of obvious necessity and evidently it was from this idea that was developed the principle subsequently embodied in the decision to maintain in America a force of ten thousand troops. A sharp eye may here perceive the contour of a cloud "no bigger than a man's hand." Though unconnected with the original suggestion, Welbore Ellis, a commonplace person whose name has been preserved from oblivion by the pen of *Junius*, appears to have had a share in giving it shape, while the support of Pitt, when the matter was before Parliament, seems to have silenced opposition. At that stage there was no thought of oppressing the colonists, for it appears reasonable that they should support the troops intended for their defense, and reasonable it would have been, if, instead of sending soldiers to New York and Boston, small garrisons had been maintained at the former French strongholds and at the chief fur-trading stations, such as Quebec and Detroit.

When the Earl of Bute, probably because of ill health, laid down the cares of office, the strong character in the new ministry was William Petty Fitzmaurice, Earl of Shelburne, a native of Dublin and a descendant of the Lords of Kerry. This statesman is, perhaps, better known as the first Marquess of Lansdowne. To the vigor of youth and a strong ambition may be ascribed the thoroughness with which he examined letters, reports from superintendents of Indian affairs, and communications from colonial governors as well as other officials. The perusal of this mass of information made him on all American questions an undoubted authority. Of the matters demanding his attention three were fundamental, namely, the maintenance of an army, the regulation of the Indian trade, and the possible contribution by the

colonies to the proposed imperial establishment. Action on these questions could be taken only after receiving information which had been requested.

Shelburne, who was not opposed to westward expansion, concluded that the new colonies could be located only where there was no danger of disturbing the rights of the Indians. This limitation described the valley of the St. Lawrence and the Floridas. As to the form of government for such plantations Shelburne did not agree with his colleagues; he was opposed to sinecures as well as patronage and favored political institutions more democratic than the existing ones. He would have the governors of the new colonies elected by the people. His ideas were defeated, however, by the influence, as he believed, of George Grenville, whose ignorance of America had much to do with the subsequent division of the empire. If Shelburne had been consistently supported, the history of the British empire would in all probability have been different from what it is.

The despicable tricks of traders and the arrival through the passes in the Alleghanies of white settlers who encroached on the Indian hunting grounds made it plain to the aborigines that their expulsion had been decreed. This feeling rendered unnecessary any interested explanation by the French, and, before long, Pontiac organized a force which in a few weeks was able to sweep the English from the West. This outbreak convinced the Lords of Trade that they had too long delayed their intended protection of the Indians. When, in October, 1763, a proclamation was finally issued, it quieted the Indians, but operated on the Canadian French with a discrimination that was gross. Yet it was not the result of a tyrannical disposition on the part of the conquerors, but rather of ministerial ignorance of American conditions. Nevertheless, when the blunder was known, it was not corrected for ten years, and during that period the vanquished French grievously suffered from its enforcement.

From the pen of Governor Murray the reader gets a vivid description of the worthies sent out "to rule by land and sea." Long before, in accounting for the inferior character of the clergy on the Irish establishment, Swift gravely explained that men of integrity and virtue had actually set forth from London, but that in crossing Hounslow Heath they were set upon by highway-

men, who exchanged garments with the ecclesiastics and went over to the sister island to assume apostolic functions. With the officers sent to rule the Canadians, however, the case was a little different, for on them the prison shades had fallen before they arrived at that classical resort.

Were Canadian Catholics subject to the same disabilities and penalties as their co-religionists in England? An attorney-general declared that they were not, while the humane Archbishop of York advised in dealing with those new subjects the adoption of a policy that was mild. At that time there was in the minds of many an expectation that kindness would ultimately convert the French settlers to Protestantism.

From their own people the Canadian priests were to receive the customary tithes. It was likewise provided that all orders of monks and nuns were to be abolished, the Jesuits immediately. One would think that the services of the latter would have secured them some indulgence, but it is certain that Englishmen of that era knew far less about Jesuit achievements than did our own historian Parkman, who though he approved of their exploits never could muster the courage to praise them. Rev. Olivier Briand was permitted to travel to Amiens, where he was consecrated Bishop of Quebec. Returning to Canada as "Superintendent of the Clergy," he received a salary of two hundred pounds a year. This restoration of rights by the method of instalment was a measure of justice performed by the Old Whigs, and, as one would expect, had the support of Edmund Burke. The author carefully describes the successive steps by which Canadian Catholics ultimately acquired civil and religious rights.

In his volumes Professor Alvord has represented many characters and described a multitude of facts, but the relation of the latter one to another and their subordination to the whole is skillfully arranged. The events which are discussed are not introduced because of their intrinsic interest, but for the reason that they contribute to the progress of the narrative. To enumerate their separate merits would require the space of a pamphlet. Therefore, in this place, we can make only a few general remarks about the author's scholarly investigation.

In the reviewer's college days the twelfth chapter of Lecky's *History of England During the Eighteenth Century* was recommended

as a good foundation for a study of the causes of the Revolutionary war. But admirable as is the summary by the gifted Irish historian, Doctor Alvord has made many important additions to, and not a few alterations in that familiar outline. Though he perceives the limitations of the Canadians, he has praise for their undoubted virtues. To him the short-comings of the British at home or abroad are not as is "a landscape to a blind man's eye." Legislation concerning religious matters is examined with candor. Without being elegant in style, and at fine writing there is no attempt, the form of this work is admirably adapted to the nature of the inquiry. The composition is everywhere clear, and throughout there are unmistakable evidences of the exercise of care as well as intelligence. In a word, the book is marked by the thoroughness characteristic of all Professor Alvord's work. In the opinion of the present reviewer these volumes form the most important contribution which for many years has been made to the literature on the American Revolution. A most comprehensive bibliography completes this valuable study.

Christopher Columbus in Poetry, History and Art. By Sara Agnes Ryan. Chicago: The Mayer & Miller Co., 1917. Pp. 165.

By the later grammarians the feminine form *authoress*, which served our precise ancestors, has been relegated to the class of outworn words. With other elements of former diction it is soon to be sought in the glossaries which explain archaic terms. Therefore Miss Ryan will be referred to as the author. Her share of this miscellany is not great. Yet from her few and short paragraphs it is clear that she does not worship contemporary specialists who treat the various phases of the eventful era of Columbus. However, it is well to be familiar with the outlines of one's field before deriding the authorities. But Miss Ryan is not writing a monograph, a biography or a history. According to her plan the poets are made to relate the story of the discovery of America. Commencing with the boyhood of Columbus, he is made to proceed man, as the Elizabethans would say, then pilot, cosmographer seaman, admiral, and discoverer.

The usual canons of criticism fail one in attempting to estimate the worth of such an anthology as this, for it has been wisely

asserted that poetry is the antithesis of science, and we are required to class history with the literature of knowledge, whose business is merely to convey information. In her pages the author has brought together a generous quantity of respectable verse, much of which is good poetry. But a few excerpts show that the drowsy muse sometimes ceases to direct the march of the poet's mind. When due allowance has been made for what is inferior, there is left in the volume much excellent poetry. And why not? Were not the writers dealing with a theme of epic grandeur?

Many of the classical fallacies concerning Columbus and his mighty project are to be found in the excerpts assembled by the author. But the work is not on this account to be condemned, for the object of the poet is to entertain his reader. Even though the quotations are quite unreliable as history, many of them are admirable as poetry. In other words, the book is to be read and re-read as pure, not as applied, literature. Lest the reader would think them few, no errors are noticed, and if they are not legion, they are yet enough to suffice for a battalion. These are not errors of Miss Ryan, but mistakes of the poets. But the reviewer desires again to remark that not one of the authors quoted has undertaken a history of the Columbian epoch or a biography of its central figure. As literature the work deserves a place in the library.

Illinois in 1818. By Solon Justus Buck. Illinois Centennial Commission. Springfield, 1917.

This year Illinois celebrates the one hundredth anniversary of its admission into the Union. A commission, appointed by the governor, has outlined a general and comprehensive plan for the centennial observance. Besides the local celebrations throughout the State, a great official celebration in Springfield, and the probable erection of a centennial memorial building, "one of the greatest and certainly the most enduring of the State's observances of the centennial anniversary will be the publication of a centennial memorial history, on a scale not before attempted by a state of the union." The history will consist of the volume hereby presented: *Illinois in* 1818, which is preliminary to the Centennial History, and five other volumes, namely: *Illinois Province and Territory*, 1673-1818; *The Frontier State*, 1818-1848; *The Era of*

Transition, 1848-1870; *The Industrial State*, 1870-1893; *The Modern Commonwealth*, 1893-1918. In all this series of publications two principles will be kept in view. They are intended first to tell the story accurately and in a scientific spirit, while not pretending to be "definitive," they are based on a careful use not only of the familiar printed sources, but also of rare newspapers and a large amount of manuscript material. Secondly, they will be books with sufficient human interest and literary quality to appeal to the intelligent reader. Footnotes and a copious bibliography are intended to help the serious student to pursue his inquiries further.

The present volume, from the pen of Professor Buck, formerly of Illinois, now of Minnesota University, augurs well for the carrying out of this program. It is entertainingly written, accurate throughout, not overburdened with references and it possesses a good index.

Although the story of Illinois is similar in many ways to that of other states in their pioneer days, we always look back with considerable pride upon those first settlers and their privations cheerfully borne because of indomitable faith in the future of the great commonwealth. Perhaps they were truly great because they had so few needs, and those their own ingenuity supplied. Of ready money there was little and little was needed. Many a family lived a whole year without the possession or use of fifty dollars in cash.

There was something wonderfully inspiring and contagious in their distinctly American conception of life and government, which spread rapidly to all squatters, backwoodsmen and farmers who came under its influence. Whether they hailed from the eastern states, from Germany or from England, they adapted themselves quickly and uncomplainingly to their new primitive environment, devoid though it was of all the comforts they had known at home. And although educational facilities were next to nothing, they imbibed at once the ideas of liberty and equality, so boldly proclaimed in the federal constitution, a generation earlier.

This is very evident in the prominence given from the earliest days to the question of slavery in Illinois politics. Although tolerated in practice and legalized under the cloak of the "in-

denture law," opposition to it was strong at all times. When the movement for admission of the Illinois territory into the Union took shape, it became all the more pronounced and fearlessly outspoken. A few pro-slavery men laid great stress on the fact that its legalization in Illinois would tend to increase immigration and foster the rapid development of the state's rich resources, as help was sorely needed for this purpose, and could not be had in any other way. The "sophistry" of this reasoning and the "fanaticism" of its protagonists were roundly denounced in the press. Yet public sentiment was not altogether ripe for the radical step of the abolition of slavery. When the constitution was finally framed, the article on slavery was ambiguously worded. It was seemingly the purpose of the constitutional convention to make Illinois ultimately a free state, and to wipe out the territorial indenture system for the future, but to interfere in no way with existing property rights in slaves or indentured servants. It was fitting that the greatest son of Illinois, half a century later, should cast aside all quibbling about vested rights in human beings and with one stroke of his pen deal the death blow to slavery.

The first settlers within the limits of the present State of Illinois were Frenchmen, mainly from Canada, who, about the beginning of the eighteenth century, established themselves in a number of villages along the American bottom, or along the Mississippi. Besides those living in and about the towns of Cahokia, Prairie du Rocher and Kaskaskia, there were a few on the eastern side of the territory, in what is now Lawrence county, who had crossed over the Wabash from the Vincennes settlement. All these were Catholics. "Each village had its Catholic Church and priest. The church was the great place of gay resort on Sundays, and holidays, and the priest was the adviser and director and companion of all his flock." (p. 91.)

Kaskaskia, which is only a memory today, consisting of a building or two on an island in the Mississippi, was, in 1809, the capital of the new territory of Illinois. It was a place of considerable commercial importance in 1818. Prairie du Rocher, fifteen miles farther up the American bottom, counted forty Catholic families in 1807. Brown's *Western Gazetteer*, in 1817, reported sixty to seventy French families and a Catholic chapel

(p. 77). This is the sum total of information about the Catholic settlers of Illinois in Professor Buck's volume. While expatiating at some length on the religious life of the Methodists and Baptists in pioneer days, he has nothing further to record concerning the French Catholics. He is rather inclined to slight their influence: "The conflict between the two elements, French and American, for the control of the Illinois country, had ended a generation before 1818, and the unprogressive French who remained in the American bottom after that contest was over, understood little of American ideals and took practically no part in the successive territorial governments."

It should not be forgotten however, and perhaps subsequent volumes in the projected "History of Illinois" will do justice to the subject, that the French were of the greatest help to George Rogers Clark in conquering the Illinois country for the American nation. They quickly became his enthusiastic supporters and ready converts to American ideals. After he had taken Kaskaskia by surprise and explained to the frightened inhabitants that if he "could have surety of their zeal and attachment to the American cause, they should immediately enjoy all the privileges of our government and that their property (should be) secured to them," he continues his narrative: "No sooner had they heard this than joy sparkled in their eyes and they fell into transports of joy that really surprised me; as soon as they were a little moderated they told me that they had always been kept in the dark as to the dispute between America and Britain, that they had never heard anything before but what was prejudicial and tended to incense them against the Americans, that they were now convinced that it was a cause they ought to espouse; that they should be happy of an opportunity to convince me of their zeal, and think themselves the happiest people in the world if they were united with the Americans. . . . The priest that had lately come from Canada had made himself a little acquainted with our dispute; contrary to the principle of his brother in Canada, was rather prejudiced in favour of us. He asked if I would give him liberty to perform his duty in his Church. I told him that I had nothing to do with churches more than to defend them from insult. That by the laws of the state his religion had as great privileges as any other. This seemed to complete their happiness. They

returned to their families, and in a few minutes the scene of mourning and distress was turned to an excess of joy, nothing else seen or heard. Adorning the streets with flowers and pavilions of different colours, completing their happiness by singing, etc."

When shortly afterwards Clark got his expeditionary force ready for the march on Vincennes, he found the Kaskaskians true to their promises. And he himself pays tribute to them in the following words: "Mr. Jeboth (Gibault) the Priest, to fully convince me of his attachment offered to undertake to win that Town for me if I would permit him and let a few of them go; they made no doubt of gaining their friends at St. Vincents to my Interest; the Priest told me he would go himself, and gave me to understand, that although he had nothing to do with temporal business, that he would give them such hints in the Spiritual way that would be very conducive to the business. In a few days the Priest, Doctr. Lefont, the Principal, with a few others set out, and a Proclamation I sent, for that purpose, and other instructions in case of success. In a few weeks they returned with intiligence agreable to my wishes. I now found myself in possession of the whole in a Country where I found I could do more real service than I expected." (Illinois Historical Collections, Vol. viii, George Rogers Clark Papers, pp. 121-123). While Professor Buck shows no intentional bias anywhere, a painstaking Catholic historian would be able to gather very interesting data concerning the part played by Catholics in the winning and the making of the great Illinois commonwealth. This first centennial ought to make the undertaking doubly worth while.

The American Indians North of Mexico. By W. H. Miner. Cambridge: 1917. Pp. x+169.

"There are two reasons" the author writes, "for offering this little volume on the Indians of North America, north of the Mexican border. At present there is not before the public a readable, comprehensive or authentic account of the original inhabitants of the American continent, which may in any way be termed popular. . . . In the second place, it is readily to be remarked that interest in the study, both cultural and descriptive, of this branch of the world's family, is, particularly in America, constantly increasing." With these two purposes in view, the writer gives to the general reader a very handy book

on a subject which has already to its credit a vast bibliography of sources and materials. The work of the Bureau of Ethnology, the Carnegie Institution, the American Museum of National History, and of the American Anthropological Association has been done mainly for scholars in this branch of American history. Of the manuals in existence, Hodge's *Handbook of American Indians* "has done more to present a clear understanding of the first Americans than has any other among present-day ethnologists." The monograph of Professor Farrand—*The Basis of American History* (1500–1900), is probably the best we possess on the subject. Miner's little work is an introductory sketch to the literature on the American Indians, and his aim throughout has been to encourage the reader to follow the subject at greater length in this literature.

An introductory chapter deals with the physiographic features of the American continent. The descriptions of the mountain ranges, the waterways, the plains and the coastal regions all have their place in any historical deductions to be made on the tribal organization of the Indians. The importance, however, of these general physical conditions may be exaggerated, for we are not yet wholly certain of the causes which influenced the migrations which were so constant. How the land became peopled is a matter of conjecture. The origin of the Indian is still unknown. His language, political institutions, and social customs are not clearly known. Group may be distinguished from group; but so far, only the linguistic classification has proven reliable. Fifty-six or fifty-eight distinct linguistic stocks among the Indians north of Mexico are recognized, and more than one third of that number inhabit the States of Oregon and California. Gallatin's *Synopsis of the Indian Tribes within the United States*, published in 1836, is the first purely scientific treatise on this linguistic grouping, and Powell's *Indian Linguistic Families North of Mexico*, published in 1891, placed this system of study on a permanent scientific basis.

Chapters follow on Indian Sociology, the Plains Indians, the Indians of the South West, and on Indian Mythology. A rather full bibliography follows, and the book is enriched with a map to illustrate the linguistic stocks among the North American Indians.

"Honest Abe," A Study in Integrity Based on the Early Life of Abraham Lincoln. By Alonzo Rothschild. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1917. Pp. 374.

This delightful narrative, which covers that part of Lincoln's career preceding his election to Congress, is the careful work of one who himself toiled upward to success. It is evident that the author was influenced in no slight degree by the example of the great Emancipator and that in this undertaking he was sustained by his affection for his theme. Before examining this excellent book, the reviewer desires to express his regret that the author was not spared to complete his work.

The learned critics may refer to Mr. Rothschild's treatment of his subject as a torso, but it is nothing of the sort, for it tells us just the things that we want to know about one phase of Lincoln's life, which in a sense was quite different from that later part of his career which included his service in the House of Representatives, the celebrated debates with Douglas, his addresses in the East, his election to the Presidency, and his conduct of the Civil War. In other words, the author describes the Lincoln who, after various tentatives, attained to eminence in Illinois and whose fame had just begun to pass the boundaries of his adopted State. The essential traits of character revealed on this smaller theatre marked his maturer years and were evident in his administration of the Presidential office. There was no fundamental change, for the transition from local attorney to national Executive made in him alterations that were hardly perceptible. His head was not turned or his heart hardened by the somewhat unexpected elevation to the highest office in the Republic. He never grew indifferent to distress or spurned the petitions of the poor. In him their short and simple annals always found a sympathetic listener.

The author refers to Lincoln's meagre opportunities for acquiring an education and enumerates the books from which he abstracted the elements of knowledge. In this place should have been mentioned Zachariah Riney, a Catholic teacher who gave the eager youth for half a year the only systematic instruction that he ever received. In any account of Lincoln's boyhood, of which we know all too little, this worthy pedagogue appears to deserve at least a paragraph and should not have been passed

over without remark. The reviewer is unable to explain this omission, for it is not to be assumed that the existence of this Kentucky schoolmaster was unknown to the author. A familiarity with the early history of that Commonwealth shows that not a little of the light of learning was brought thither by Catholic missionaries. In fact, Bardstown was the residence of the first bishop beyond the mountains.

The topics treated by Mr. Rothschild are "Pinching Times," "Truth in Law," "Professional Ethics," " Dollars and Cents," "Honesty in Politics." At this point, when Lincoln was chosen to Congress, the author's work was ended by his death. If any criticism is to be hazarded, it is that to prove facts well established cumulative testimony has been adduced. With fewer illustrations the honesty, the indifference to money, and the general integrity of Lincoln would be regarded as satisfactorily shown. However, Lincoln's admirers do not easily tire of reviewing the evidence. To us the book is interesting because of the somewhat new interpretation of this part of his remarkable career, an interpretation abundantly supported by the facts marshaled by the author.

NOTES AND COMMENT

The value of the annual volumes of the United States Catholic Historical Society's *Historical Records and Studies* can easily be gathered from the Index of the first ten volumes (1899–1917) compiled by Miss Herbermann, and printed in the last issue (Vol. XI, December, 1917). Special attention deserves to be called to a little-known aspect of American Catholic history, namely the *Diplomatic Intercours with the Papacy*, which Mr. Thomas F. Meehan has brought to light in the present volume. "An investigation of the official register of the State Department at Washington," he says, "gives the following list of the diplomatic representatives of the United States at the court of the Pope:

JACOB L. MARTIN, North Carolina, confirmed as Chargé d'affaires, April 7, 1848. Died at post August 26, 1848.

LEWIS CASS, JR., Michigan, Chargé d'affaires, January 5, 1849. Minister Resident, June 29, 1854. Presented credentials as such November 9, 1854. Took leave November 27, 1858.

JOHN P. STOCKTON, New Jersey, Commissioned Minister Resident June 15, 1858. Took leave May 23, 1861.

ALEXANDER W. RANDAL, Wisconsin. Commissioned Minister Resident August 6, 1861. Left post about August 4, 1862.

RICHARD M. BLATCHFORD, New York. Commissioned Minister Resident August 9, 1862. Left post and resigned in United States October 6, 1863.

RUFUS KING, Wisconsin. Commissioned Minister Resident October 7, 1863. Was previously commissioned March 22, 1861, but declined. Left post August, 1867. Resigned in the United States January 1, 1868.

"The temporal power of the Pope having been usurped at this period the legation has since lapsed, but, as can be seen, it existed during the administration of Presidents Polk, Taylor, Fillmore, Pierce, Buchanan, Lincoln and Johnson and immediately subject in its direction to such notable Secretaries of State as James Buchanan, John M. Clayton, Daniel Webster, Edward Everett, William L. Marcy, Lewis Cass, Jeremiah S. Black, and William H. Seward." This is a subject which deserves recognition from American historical writers. Attempts have been made on several occasions to see the diplomatic *cahiers* for these twenty years, but the State Department officials have not seen the necessity of allowing them to be catalogued and analyzed.

Students of the early history of the Americas, a subject which is especially interesting to Catholics, will have every reason to rejoice in the appearance of the first number of *The Hispanic-American Historical Review* which is now in press. This new quarterly in the historical field had its origin in the American Historical Association which perhaps a little over a year ago appointed a committee to look after the details of organization. After lengthy deliberations, a Board of six Editors was chosen, consisting of the following experts: James Alexander Robertson, of the United States Bureau of Domestic and Foreign Commerce; William R. Manning, of the University of Texas; W. S. Robertson, of the University of Illinois; Charles E. Chapman, of the University of California;

I. J. Cox, of the University of Cincinnati; and Julius Klein, of Harvard University; to which were added W. R. Shepherd, of Columbia University, and Herbert E. Bolton, of the University of California, as Advisory Editors. The first of those mentioned, James Alexander Robertson, has had a long career of usefulness, first as the Editor (with Miss Blair of the University of Wisconsin) of the collection of Philippine Documents in fifty-five volumes, and subsequently as Librarian of the Public Library of Manila, and has been chosen as the Managing Editor.

Under his management, the first number of the *Review* is now ready for publication. A glance over its contents will be sufficient to indicate at once its scope and its great probability of success. There is a *Letter from President Wilson*, which is followed by *A New Historical Journal*, from the pen of J. Franklin Jameson, Director of the Department of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. *The Founding of the Review* is well described by Charles E. Chapman, one of the Board of Editors. Charles W. Hackett, of the University of California, contributes an article on *The Delimitation of Spanish Jurisdiction in North America to* 1535, and Charles H. Cunningham, of the University of Texas, who has recently contributed to the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, writes an article on *The Institutional Background of Spanish America*. Then comes *The Recognition of the Spanish Colonies by the Mother Country* by W. S. Robertson, one of the Board of Editors. This is followed by the usual department of Book Reviews, Notes and Comments, and a Bibliographical section which contains an article in Spanish by J. T. Medina, perhaps the most illustrious bibliographer of the American continent, at present connected with the University of Santiago de Chile. The title of his paper is *Los obras de Viajeros norte-americanos traducidas al castellano*. This section also contains some bibliographical notes, which will be a regular feature of future issues, by C. K. Jones, of the Library of Congress and the George Washington University. The current number is brought to a close by a list of recent publications, articles as well as printed books.

Dr. Robertson, the managing Editor, to whom the readers of the last number of the REVIEW need no introduction, is certainly to be congratulated upon the contents of this first number and the standard of selection manifest in it presages a merited success. Catholics especially should be interested in this new quarterly, seeing that Hispanic-American history at certain periods is almost synonymous with Catholic missionary history in the Americas. The REVIEW therefore bespeaks a hearty support from Catholics for its new sister, in the matter of subscription and of perusal of its contents and as well in the contribution of articles. The subscription price is $3.00 a year and the office of the Managing Editor is 1422 Irving Street, N. E., Washington, D. C.

In mentioning the Board of Editors of this new REVIEW, we are reminded of the interesting work upon which one of its Editors, William R. Manning, Professor of Latin-American History in the University of Texas, is now engaged.

In the spring of 1916, Dr. Alejandro Alvarez, the distinguished Chilean publicist, proposed to the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace the publication of American diplomatic correspondence regarding the emancipation of the Latin American countries from the year 1810 to 1830. Pursuant to the Endowment's acceptance of this proposal, Dr. Manning was persuaded to spend a year in Washington in the collection of this correspondence.

To this task he has brought no mean qualifications. As a contributor to *The Southwestern Historical Quarterly, The American Journal of International Law, The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, and to other scientific periodicals; as the author of the Albert Shaw Lectures on Diplomatic History, delivered in 1913 at the Johns Hopkins University and published in 1916 under the title, *Early Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Mexico;* and as Professor of Diplomatic Relations at the George Washington University and of Latin-American History at the University of Texas, his selection is a just one, for he was a logical man for the task. Owing, however, to the entry of the United States into the present war, the Department of State has found it inexpedient to give him access to its archives at the present time, and he has been collecting material to be found in the published official documents of the United States. There can be no doubt that, when the project has been completed, the work will be of inestimable value to the student of the early history of the United States.

The Carnegie Endowment is also engaged in collecting for publication the views of the Latin American Republics upon the Monroe Doctrine, outlined in President Monroe's message to Congress of December 2, 1823. As a companion volume to this, it is proposed to collect the official papers concerning the doctrine which have been issued from time to time by the Government of the United States, and a collection of the statements of accredited publicists of the United States interpreting, defining and applying the doctrine.

The projects which have just been mentioned are a part of the work of the Endowment's Division of International Law. Its Division of Economics and History has just published a work interesting to the student of Latin-American history, namely, Dana G. Munro's *The Five Republics of Central America*, which is one of a series of studies intended by the Endowment to present the history and economic conditions in the Latin American Republics. The present volume is the result of several months of study on the ground. Dr. Munro travelled by all the usual means of locomotion through the countries he describes, getting his information, as far as possible, at first hand, and from this he has endeavored to correct the false impression of many persons in the United States that Central America is "a land of revolutions, bankrupt governments, and absconding presidents, and a haven for fugitives from justice from more settled countries."

The great difficulties in the way of making a careful study of this subject are due to the absence of trustworthy written material. Historical works are notor-

iously unreliable, although the colonial period is ably treated in two or three books by Central American authors. The development of the community, however, since its separation from Spain has apparently never been adequately treated. Dr.Munro, therefore, is to be felicitated upon performing an extremely useful task in handling this subject under the following topics: *The Country and the People, Central American Political Institutions, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica, The Establishment of a Central American Federation, The Causes of Central American Revolutions, The Washington Conference of* 1907, *The Intervention of the United States in Nicaragua, Commerce, Central American Public Finance,* and *The Influence of the United States in Central America.* The volume also contains a good bibliography of the more important historical and descriptive material dealing with Central America and a very good index.

Naturally, one of the first aspects a Catholic would look for in such a work is the author's treatment of the question of religion. In this his judgment seems to be very fair and accurate, although a little more space might have been given to the Church's influence. Acknowledging a low morality, he attributes it to a lack of religious restraints. The Church at one time was very powerful throughout the Isthmus, but after the Declaration of Independence, the Liberal leaders expelled the Archbishop and many of the priests, and suppressed all the convents. And although the people even now are Catholics, at least nominally, the Religious Orders were never revived, except in Guatemala from 1839 to 1871, when they were suppressed again. Many of the women are still very devout, but the men, especially among the upper classes, are for the most part frankly irreligious. The Central American has many good qualities, being good natured, affable, profoundly attached to his friends and to the members of his family, and deeply susceptible to lofty ideals and patriotic impulses. There are a few non-Catholic missionaries from England and the United States, but "Protestantism is so utterly unsuited to the temperament of the people that they have made few converts," in spite of the fact that the Church has lost much of its old-time hold on the people.

For the purpose of testing the accuracy of Dr. Munro's work, Chapters IV and XI which give the history of Nicaragua were selected. Several years ago, when contemplating an educational mission to this republic, an American Catholic student of history had occasion to delve into Nicaraguan history. He interviewed the then Minister of Nicaragua, General Emiliano Chamorro, now president of the Republic, as well as several travellers connected with the Bureau of the Pan-American Republics. And while all were most courteous and desirous of furnishing him with information, none could refer him to a good history of the growth and development of the republic such as has now been furnished by Dr. Munro. The story of Walker's filibustering expeditions was to be found in many places, although Scroggs (*Filibusters and Financiers.* New York, 1916) has made improvement even in this direction, but as for an intimate history of the people of Nicaragua, their origin, their idio-

syncrasies, the reason for their meteoric history, it was nowhere to be found gathered together between the covers of a single book. Consequently, we are inclined to think that if the balance of the Dr. Murno's book is as accurately and as interestingly composed as are his romantic chapters upon Nicaragua, it certainly supplies a long-felt want and makes one eager to see the South American Republics receive similar treatment from similarly capable hands.

Our Country in Story, by the Franciscan Sisters of the Perpetual Adoration of La Crosse, Wis., marks a decided step forward in the field of reading-books in history for our schools. It is intended primarily for the pupils of the fifth and sixth grades of our elementary schools, and the forty odd stories contained in the book tell in a very striking manner many of the more notable events in the history of our country. In these various narratives, we are told in the Foreword, "are portrayed the Catholic missionary, discoverer, explorer, and statesman, bringing out the influence of faith on character and actions." The stories are arranged in admirable order and there is a distinctive charm in the telling which will appeal to many who have long since bade good-bye to the days of the fifth and sixth grades. The book is well illustrated with 117 pictures and is well balanced with maps, questions, and references to further reading. The Index deserves mention, the words being accentuated for easy pronunciation by the child. (The volume is published by Scott, Foresman and Company, of Chicago, and is sold at seventy-two cents.)

The Carnegie Endowment's sister corporation, the Carnegie Institution of Washington, has been very active in publishing guides to the history of the United States in various archives, the historian's "tools," so to speak. It is not believed that Catholics are quite so familiar as they should be with this great work which is being done under the supervision of Dr. J. Franklin Jameson, Director of the Institution's Department of Historical Research. Every Catholic student of history ought to know and use these valuable aids to scientific historical research. So far Guides to American history have appeared for the Government Archives in Washington (Van Tyne and Leland), the Diplomatic Archives of the Department of State, 1789–1840 (McLaughlin), Papers in Washington Archives relating to Territories of the United States (Parker), Canadian Archives (Parker), Manuscript Materials to 1783 in the British Museum, in Minor London Archives, and in the Libraries of Oxford and Cambridge (Andrews and Davenport), Materials to 1783 in the Public Record Office of London (Andrews), Materials since 1783 in London Archives (Paullin and Paxson), Materials in Spanish Archives including those of Simancas, the Archivo Histórico Nacional and Seville (Shepherd), Documents in Spanish Archives which have been printed or of which transcriptions are preserved in American libraries (Robertson), Materials in the principal Archives of Mexico (Bolton), Materials in Cuban Archives (Peréz), Materials in Roman and other Italian Archives (Fish), Materials in German State Archives (Learned), Materials in Swiss and Austrian Archives (Faust), Documents in the *Papeles Pro-*

cedentes de Cuba, deposited in the Archivo General de Indias at Seville (Hill), and Materials in Russian Archives (Golder).

Perhaps the more interesting of these guides from the Catholic point of view are Shepherd's Spanish Archives and Fish's Roman and Other Italian Archives. Nine-tenths of the latter book relates to Archives in Rome. In that city the two collections most abounding in materials for American history, and described in the most detailed manner in this volume, are the Archives of the Vatican and those of the Congregation of the Propaganda. The former embraces the correspondence of the Papal Secretaries of State with the Nuncios of Spain, France and other colonizing countries, and various correspondence with bishops and other ecclesiastics in America. Taken in connection with the Archives of the Propaganda, these Archives not only display with great fullness the ecclesiastical and religious history of early America and of the Catholic portions of the United States, but also cast an extraordinary amount of light upon civil history and administration, especially French and Spanish. Besides the Vatican Archives, the volume embraces the manuscripts in the Vatican Library, in other ecclesiastical collections and in public and private libraries in Rome. The Archives of Naples, Venice, Turin and Florence are likewise included and there is a full index.

With such examples as these as incentives, it is clear that some enterprising Catholic or an American Catholic Historical Association ought to do for the Catholic Church Archives what Allison has done for the Protestant Church Archives in his *Inventory of Unpublished Material for American Religious History in Protestant Church Archives and Other Repositories*, published by the Carnegie Institution in 1911. The only attempt so far in this direction is that carried on some years ago by the American Catholic Historical Society, of Philadelphia, which supported a research-worker at Rome for some time. His transcripts (typewritten) are at the Society's home, 715 Spruce Street, Philadelphia.

A work of particular value and interest to students of the influence of the Catholic Church upon early American history is Davenport's *European Treaties Bearing on the History of the United States and its Dependencies to* 1648, which has just been published by the Carnegie Institution. Everyone knows that the texts, especially the earlier ones, of the European treaties relating to America, are in many cases difficult to obtain. Many of them are in books to which few historical students have access. Some have not been printed at all. Most have been printed with greater or less degrees of inaccuracy and incompleteness. Dr. Davenport, after several years of study in European libraries and archives, as well as in Washington, has assembled in this volume accurate texts of all those treaties or parts of treaties anterior to 1649 which bear in any direct way upon the history of the present United States or its insular dependencies (Porto Rico and the Philippines, so far as the present volume is concerned).

Miss Davenport has also procured and included accurate texts of the papal bulls relating to America, documents which under the international law and practice of their period had a status and force similar to that of treaties. A facsimile and translation of the letters of Pope Alexander VI, concerning the so-called "Line of Demarcation," and of other papal bulls were published by Heywood in 1893 and one of his twenty-five copies is on deposit in the Museum of the Catholic University of America, but Heywood's volume lacks the scientific exactness which Dr. Davenport has brought to bear upon her work.

In her work, documents in any other language than English and French have been accompanied with careful translations. To each document an introduction is prefixed in which the history of its making, a *mise en scène* so to speak, is set forth. These introductions make an approach to a consecutive history of European diplomacy respecting America down to the time of the treaties of Westphalia. Introductions and texts are carefully annotated and bibliographical sections give suitable references to all matters respecting the documents and their history. The work gives ample evidence of the painstaking care and the laborious attention to details which are at once a delight to the reader and a proof of the author's scholarly ability.

Mr. George Dobbin Brown, of the Library of Princeton University, has published an *Essay towards a Bibliography of the published Writings and Addresses of Woodrow Wilson* (1910-1917). It is a continuation of Mr. Clemons' *Essay*, which covers the years 1875-1910. The President's writings have often been the subject of the bibliographer; five other bibliographies, besides the two mentioned, have already been published. All the subjects listed by Mr. Brown are not of equal importance, and the system he has followed—the chronological—leaves much room for improvement. A subject index with cross references would have made this pamphlet of actual value. The writings and addresses are not analyzed, and in many cases the reader has no reference to the publication.

Monday, February 4, 1918, will live long in the history of St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, New York, as "Encyclopedia Day." The Saturday previous two hundred and six sets of the special *Dunwoodie Edition* of the *Catholic Encyclopedia* arrived on motor trucks at the Seminary and were distributed among the seminarians. An elaborate programme had been arranged, and addresses were made up by Rev. Philip J. Furlong, in behalf of the student body, by Father Wynne, S. J., Monsignor Chidwick and Bishop Shahan. It means much for an intelligent and enthusiastic love for Church history among the future priests of New York Diocese that this valuable work has been placed in their hands. The clergy of the Diocese participated by creating for the purpose a fund which will enable the Editors of the *Encyclopedia* to supply future students with the work.

An historic document of the highest value appeared in the *Congressional Record* for March 18, 1918—the address of the Hon. Ambrose Kennedy, of Rhode Island, before the House of Representatives, on the Memorial to the "Nuns of the Battle Field." Mr. Kennedy passed in review the work done

by many of the Sisterhoods in the Civil War, and urged the acceptance of the resolution which authorized Congress to permit the members of the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians in America to erect at their own expense a fitting memorial in the city of Washington as a tribute to the nuns who displayed courage on the battlefield and in the hospitals. The resolution passed the Senate on the following day, and there can be no longer any reproach that an official reward to these devoted women has never been given. Praise is given by Mr. Kennedy in his address to Mrs. Ellen Ryan Jolly, the President of the Ladies' Auxiliary.

A "Pioneer Priest," writing in the *Catholic Register* of Kansas City, Mo., gives the following evidence for the fact that President Lincoln was born in the Catholic faith:

> At every anniversary of President Lincoln's birth, we hear much of his life. His boyish pranks are yearly repeated, but his religion in his youth is seldom mentioned. This can be accounted for by the fact that, in his youth, Lincoln was a Catholic, a member of a Church that takes not into consideration earthly honor, power, or glory, extolls only for virtues that lead to Heaven. While it is true she has on her list of saints, thousands of kings, queens, and others in high station, they are not there because of their accidental positions of power in this world but for the way they served God. Lincoln's father and his stepmother were Catholics. Some dispute the religion of his father, but Father J. M. J. St. Cyr, in whose parish the Lincolns lived, says Thomas Lincoln was a Catholic, and he adds, "I often said Mass in his house and heard the confessions of his children." Father Lefever, who, when stationed at Indian Creek, Monroe County, Mo., had for his parish four counties in Missouri and five in Illinois, always said Mass in the Lincoln home when visiting Clarys Grove, Ill. The Lincolns came to Clarys Grove from Rolling Fork, Ky., when young Abe was born. Father Lefever, afterwards Bishop Lefever of Detroit, was in Paris, France, at the time of Lincoln's assassination. To a reporter for the *Monde* published there, he said, "I am pained to hear of poor Lincoln's death." He declared the affair might not have happened, "had he but taken the advice I gave him when he was a boy living in New Salem, to avoid all places of public amusement during the Holy season of Lent. 'Say your beads, Abe,' I told him. Here, now, he had been killed in a theatre on Good Friday. Poor Abe was a good, kind boy. He used to help me fix a place to say Mass. He once made six chairs and gave them to me. After I left there, I lost track of him. I was told he married a Presbyterian and fell away from the religion of his young days, otherwise he would not have been where he was when assassinated. I hope they will get the murderer." Archbishop Ireland of St. Paul, who was a chaplain in the army, said in the *New York Tablet* in 1869 that "Lincoln never denied his religion, but having joined some society condemned by the Church, he naturally fell away." The late Bishop Hogan of Kansas City wrote exhaustively on the subject many years ago and his writings are still preserved in a scrapbook in the Cathedral residence.

Mr. Thomas F. Meehan, whose article on Cornelius Heeney appears in this issue of the REVIEW, writes us as follows: "In the very interesting and valuable

list of early Catholic publications contributed by Mr. William Stetson Merrill to the October number of the REVIEW there are three titles (pp. 322-323) relating to New York and Boston which he chances as belonging to his list because of the "Irish" names they bear. This chance does not seem to be well taken. The first cited by Mr. Merrill is a broadside printed in New York, January 23, 1769, in which Thomas Randall denies that "Thomas Smith reflected on the Irish at the last election." In 1769, Catholics were not supposed to exist in New York. The historic John Leary then had his leather shop in what is now Cortland Street and tradition says he used to go to Philadelphia to make his Easter duty. Scoville in his *Old Merchants of New York* says: "A man did not dare to say he was a Catholic in those days." Certainly Thomas Randall did not. He probably was one of those legal pirates, master of the privateer *Fox*, and the incident mentioned was merely a local election row. Walter Bassett quotes the text of the broadside and tells of the election in his *Old Merchants of New York*. Also dated 1769, the second of Mr. Merrill's titles is an "Irishman's Petition to the Commissioner of Excise" and signed by Pat. O'Connor, Blaney O'Shea, Carney Macguire and Lawrence Sweeney. There is nothing Catholic about an excise petition and as for the names attached to it, they are no indication of the faith of these signatories in early New York. Such names are often most misleading for that period. The third citation Mr. Merrill makes is that of the book of Statutes, Constitutions, etc. (Boston, 1774-75) of the Friendly Brothers of St. Patrick. There was nothing Catholic but the Saint's name about this society; it was the convivial organization through which the officers of the English army celebrated St. Patrick's day. Each branch was called a "Knot." In the late John D. Crimmins' *Celebrations of St. Patrick's Day in America*, several notices of these celebrations by the "Knots" in New York are quoted (pp. 27-28). All this does not detract in the least from the many other finds Mr. Merrill's industrious researches have so fortunately made for our list of earliest publications."

Historical scholars throughout the United States, but particularly in the Mississippi Valley, will rejoice in the foundation of the Illinois Catholic Historical Society, with headquarters in Chicago. The honorary presidents are the Archbishops and Bishops of the Province of Chicago. Mr. William J. Onahan, a well-known student in American history, has been elected President. The First Vice-President, through whose inspiration the Society mainly came into existence, is the Very Reverend Frederic Siedenburg, S. J., of Loyola University. Particularly gratifying is the announcement of the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review*, which is to appear quarterly, beginning with April, 1918.

Dr. Cooper's *Analytical and Critical Bibliography of the Tribes of Tierra del Fuego and Adjacent Territory* has drawn considerable attention to the Catholic Missions of that far-away part of the American continent. The natives inhabiting the southern tip of the American continent fall into two groups: the Onas of Tierra del Fuego Island, closely related to the Patagonians; the Yahgans, Alacaluf, and now probably extinct Chonos of the Magellanic and Chonoan

archipelagos, closely related to the modern Botocudos of eastern Brazil and to the archaic race that first peopled the greater part of southern South America. The Fuegians and Botocudos are culturally the most backward peoples on the American continent. The Yahgans are the southernmost inhabitants of America and of the world. The evangelization of the Chonos was first undertaken by the Jesuit Fathers Melchor de Venegas and Juan Bautista Ferrufino, in 1609, and continued intermittently until the expulsion of the Jesuits from Chile in 1767. English Protestant missionaries began work among the Yahgans in the 'fifties of the last century; the leading figure among these missionaries was the Rev. Thomas Bridges. For the last quarter century the Salesian Fathers have been actively engaged among the Alacaluf and Onas. Anthropology is particularly indebted to the Rev. Thomas Bridges for his linguistic and cultural studies of the Yahgans, and to the Salesians, particularly Fathers José M. Beauvoir and Maggiorino Borgatello, for their valuable contributions to our knowledge of the languages and customs of the Onas and Alacaluf.

Mr. William S. McLaughlin, a well-known student of Catholic history in the Diocese of New York, writes to us: "In your *Notes and Comment* of the January (1918) issue, page 493, there is a notice on Bishop Bruté's MSS. The following letter would indicate that all the papers of the illustrious Bishop were not sent to New York." He copies it as published by the late Martin I. J. Griffin, in July, 1892.

Dear Sir:

The Most Reverend Archbishop being hindered by his many occupations from answering your letter of the 24th of May, has requested me to write to you in his name.

The Papers of the late B'p Bruté were far from being complete when they came into the Archbishop's hands; they have evidently been examined by some one, who had taken from them many important papers, especially those of an historical nature. When the first arrived here, I examined them myself, in the hope of finding important information upon certain matters, to which I had turned my attention—and discovered nothing worth preserving, tho' during his whole life he had employed more or less time in making researches connected with the history of the Catholic Religion in this part of the world. As however I did not examine them particularly in reference to the Indian Missions, there may be some documents connected with them, that I may have overlooked—and I will take an early opportunity of looking them over again, so that if I discover anything to interest you, I will let you know. The Rev. Mr. Shea of the Society of Jesus, has been for some time engaged upon a History of the Jesuit Missions amongst the Indians—and from his particular fitness for the task, as well as the valuable documents in his possession, I have no doubt that it will prove a valuable addition to the early history of our country. The Most Rev'd Archbishop requests me to convey to you his kind regards.

I remain, with sincere Respect,
Very truly yours,
J. B. Bayley,
Secretary.

Jas. H. Causten, Jr., Esq.,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. McLaughlin calls attention to the fact that the Archives in Baltimore should possess a large collection of the Bruté letters. Archbishop Kenrick, for instance, while Bishop of Philadelphia, was the recipient of many letters from Father Bruté. Over the signature "Vincennes," Bishop Bruté wrote a series of letters in the *Catholic Telegraph* relative to the early missions of the Jesuits, from the Lakes to the Mississippi.

The *International Mind in the Teaching of History* is the title of an appositely written paper by Mary Sibley Evans, in the March number of the *History Teacher's Magazine*. There are four phases, she points out, in the application of the international mind to historical facts. The first concerns itself with *sectionalism* in our country; the second deals with our *provincialism*, or our attitude towards the stranger within our gates; the third concerns itself with our *attitude towards other nations;* and the fourth concerns itself with our *relations with the past*. Our *sectionalism* is a canker at the heart of that fuller and more compact Americanism which is the patriotic ideal of a statesmanlike love of country. "There are still some of us who classify all Northerners as cold and hard; all Southerners as lazy and inefficient; all Westerners as rough and blustering; all Easterners as luxury-loving and degenerate. . . . Rarely, indeed, does the visitor in the Congressional gallery hear a speech which presents the issues and the interests of the country as a whole. He comes away properly depressed by the sectional spirit which prevails in our national law-making body." The Casualty Lists which are coming back from the front ought to have a permanent effect upon the "tragic and undemocratic" self-betrayal of that type of American who speaks in his sorry provincialism of "Wops" and "Dagoes." If those lists are studied the proud Anglo-Saxon must needs ask himself whether in the American army at present his race, which he considers American par excellence is really represented. There is no doubt that the war will affect profoundly our "international mind" on these first two points, but it is highly questionable whether we are prepared by education and by growth for that broader international spirit which will lead us to see straight and true amid the many national antipathies which made up the world before the war. The last phase can be summed up in a few words; courage to see our own precise part in the great stream of political events since the beginning of our history, the relationship between the great movements of the past with our own development, and "the most crying need for the honesty to admit our own sins and shortcomings." Perhaps the skepticism that has come upon us in our endeavor to learn the truth of the present war may arouse us *to tell the truth* to our children about the American Revolution, the War of 1812, the unrighteousness of our war with Mexico over Texas, the horrors of Reconstruction, the appalling dishonesty of the War with Spain, and the crimes that are being committed right now day by day against the poor. But American education from the lowest rung of its hierarchy to the highest is so saturated with fallacies and lies, especially in the story of its origin and its political growth, that the hope for the international mind seems doomed to disappointment. No true and lasting Love of Country can be created outside the School of Truth.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

III. HISTORICAL COMPOSITION

As an introductory chapter to the *Bibliographia Catholica Americana*, projected in these pages in the initial number of the REVIEW, short papers were planned on three main divisions of historical work: namely, *Historical Research* (Historical Bibliography, Auxiliary Sciences, and Historical Method), *Historical Criticism* (Provenance, and Exegesis), and *Historical Composition*. Strictly speaking, Historical Method, which is a more general term for this series of operations, has but two parts—Analysis and Synthesis.

Langlois-Seignobos, for example, in their *Introduction to the Study of History*, have followed this system. Their volume is divided into three Books. The first Book on *Preliminary Studies* introduces the student to the methods of research for documentary material, and to the auxiliary sciences. The second Book, on the *Analytical Operations*, touches upon the following subjects:

Introduction: GENERAL CONDITIONS OF HISTORICAL KNOWLEDGE.
Section I: EXTERNAL CRITICISM.—I. *Textual Criticism.* II. *Critical Investigation of Authorship.* III. *Critical Classification of Sources.* IV. *Critical Scholarship and Scholars.*
Section II: INTERNAL CRITICISM.—I. *Interpretative Criticism* (Hermeneutics). II. *Negative Internal Criticism of the Good Faith and Accuracy of Authors.* III. *Determination of Particular Facts.*

The third Book, entitled *Synthetic Operations*, contains five chapters on the following topics:

I. *General Conditions of Historical Construction.* II. *The Grouping of Facts.* III. *Constructive Reasoning.* IV. *The Construction of General Formulae.* V. *Exposition.*

The work of Historical Composition may be understood to embrace the whole of these synthetical operations, some of which make up the remote preparations for the final draft, and others of which are of proximate value for the same. The remote preparation starts where the process of analysis leaves off. All analysis properly organized begins under definite and almost rigid limitations.[1] These limitations are generally of time, place, and idea. Placing boundaries to the subject beforehand gives a reasonable restraint upon the research-work, especially on the bibliographical field, and at times a limit to the process of critical interpretation. For beginners in the scientific study of history, limitation is one of the surest safeguards. Historical research familiarizes the student with the general and special knowledge necessary for his subject. Historical criticism supplies him for his work with a mass of isolated facts, which have more or less stood the test of investigation. But the net result of these opera-

[1] "The operations of history are so numerous, from the first discovery of the document to the final formula of the conclusion, they require such minute precautions, so great a variety of natural gifts and acquired habits, that there is no man who can perform by himself all the work on any one point."—LANGLOIS-SEIGNOBOS, *op. cit.*, p. 229.

tions is not history. The facts gathered must go through a process of synthesis, before the real work of historical exposition can be started.

It is this process of synthetic operations which we call the remote preparation. The general conditions of historical composition or construction are based upon the principle that "the mode of construction cannot be regulated by the ideal plan of the science we desire to construct; it depends on the materials we have at our disposal. It would be chimerical to formulate a scheme which the materials would not allow us to carry out; it would be like proposing to construct an Eiffel Tower with building-stones."[2] The process of analysis, when completed, may, indeed, "leave the student of history with a body of disjointed and disconnected facts,"[3] but it is too much to say as Seignobos has done, that the synthetic operations must necessarily begin with "an incoherent mass of minute facts, with detailed knowledge reduced as it were to a powder." The mind cannot help grouping the facts obtained. The limitations which the student places upon his research, gradually bring into relief in his own mind the natural grouping of time, place and idea; and the overlapping which occurs with any one of these three divisions, already starts the loom of history in motion. It is true that the page will lack the one element which makes history readable, that is, reality, unless the facts found are visioned by the student in their original setting. Imagination plays an important part in combining different elements of fact knowledge, and when all the facts at one's command are thus revivified, grouping must be done, very largely again under the influence of imagination. The gaps which occur between facts or between groupings of facts call for something more serious than vision. Logic has to be applied, and historical reasoning brought into action. Little by little, classified groupings emerge with more and more distinctness, and from these groupings a species of general reasoning can be drawn which leads up to formulas or conclusions. Hence, the four stages in the process of historical construction: (1) the visioning of the facts; (2) the grouping of facts; (3) constructive reasoning; (4) the construction of general formulae.

All this, however, does not complete the process. This is what Father Fonck, S. J., in the *Travail Scientifique* (p. 141) calls the *mise en oeuvre des materiaux*. So far, the constructive process merely arranges the *materiaux* for the last stage of historical work; namely, Exposition. "A little thought," says Collins, "will show how frequently this last step is left unfinished; how many there are who seem to be able to produce materials for history but not to write history. Nor is it only a question of the possession and the utilization of a good literary style. Many who have this cannot write history, and many who have it not can yet do so; for from this point of view, as we have said already, style is nothing but the vehicle for the presentation of the work to the world after that work is in effect complete. What is really needed is that the facts should be digested and systematised until they have their right perspective and their right proportion: a perspective and proportion which will depend indeed upon the point of view,

---

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 211.

[3] Collins, *Study of Ecclesiastical History*, p. 51. London, 1903.

but which, when this is once taken up, have a real existence. Then they must be presented in such a way as to form one whole with a unity of its own, just as the elements of a landscape combine to form one whole, or as the elements of a picture ought to combine to form one whole."[4]

Exposition can be said to demand mainly three things: a *plan*, *sincerity*, and a *power of expression*.

The materials at one's command and the purpose in view will naturally dominate the plan of the work. There must be a well-balanced proportion between the materials and the viewpoint. The viewpoint in historical writing has undergone changes, and historians have not all the same conception of the end aimed at by historical work. Hence the "mode of writing history" is not and has not been a constant one. The three main schools of historiography are the *narrative*, the *didactic*, and the *genetic*. The narrative school of historians has as its aim "to preserve the memory and propagate the knowledge of glorious deeds, or of events which were of importance to a man, a family, or a people."[5] So much religious history is still written from this standpoint that its value has little that is permanent. This is the easiest kind of history to compose, for the chronological "mode" usually provides a cloak for large gaps in historical facts and in historical reasoning. Most Church Histories are written in the simple narrative style with an occasional skirmish into the didactic. When facts are selected because they are useful in business, in politics, in religion, or in education, or when the search is for precedents to enlighten statesmen or churchmen, for arguments to support a cause or a theory, or for ethical ideals to surprise the world, then we have the so-called didactic conception of history.[6] Herodotus is called the founder of narrative history; Thucydides, the father of pragmatic or didactic history. "For more than two thousand years after Herodotus and Thucydides," writes Johnson, "the narrative and the didactic types of history seemed to exhaust the possibilities of historical construction. The particular forms which they assumed, the particular kinds of facts which they celebrated, the particular kinds of lessons or precedents which they sought to impress, the particular philosophies which they invoked to explain events were bewildering in their variety, but the general types persisted."[7] In its narrative and didactic forms, history was considered more as a branch of literature than as a distinct science with its own laws and customs. A change came about the middle of the nineteenth century, when the strict methods of procedure in other sciences were applied to history. This has given rise to the science of historical research, and of historical criticism. It has also brought into being a new type of historical composition—the historical monograph with all its scientific apparatus of notes, references, and *pièces justificatives*. This third school which cannot be said to dominate history writing outside the Universities, is the genetic or development school. Its cornerstone is criticism, and it is this all-ruling fact which keeps it

[4] *Op. cit.*, pp. 63–64.
[5] LANGLOIS-SEIGNOBOS, *op. cit.*, p. 297.
[6] JOHNSON, *Teaching of History*, p. 17. New York, 1916.
[7] *Op. cit.*, pp. 22–23.

from becoming popular. "Uncritical histories of the narrative and didactic types are still being produced. There are still those who demand that history shall first of all be literature. There are others, the majority of schoolmasters among them, who demand that history shall first of all be lessons in moral or patriotism, or social service. There are others, and here must be included a large part of the legion described as 'the general reading public,' who demand of history only that it shall be interesting. *To many of these the very idea of scientific history with its destructive criticism, its denial of the right of personal bias, and its sober gray of fact, amounting in many cases to a mere balancing of probabilities without definite conclusions, is somewhat repugnant.*"[8]

Scientific history has called itself too often evolutionary history or history acting under the principles of evolution, and has appeared too often as if guided by some of the false standards of "Higher Criticism," for it to be given the place of honor among those who see in Church history something just as important as the accurate narration of *human* events. The ecclesiastical historian cannot hold fast to the aim which should be present in his work, if the genetic mode alone be followed. Events are to be related, it is true, with the strictest accuracy possible, and general formulae or conclusions are only to be drawn in strict conformity with the rules of logic; but beyond this comes the moral lesson for the present and the future. The mere recital of the discovery of America, the story of its colonization, its birth as a nation, its wars, and its progress, is not American history. There must be running through the pages of the book we put in the hands of our children the living fire of love for their country, of admiration for the great men of the past, of honest appreciation of the shabby side of our history, and above all the spirit of patriotic purpose in the upbuilding of their character as citizens of the land. No less and no more is asked of Church history. Honesty, sincerity, and impartiality must never be absent from the narrative. The lessons drawn from the past must never be exaggerated—*quod nimis probat, nihil probat.* But in every case the facts offered must be substantiated by sources which have stood the test of criticism. History is one of the greatest teachers of truth. It gives *great principles* by which to judge events, and in the light of these principles a triple result is bound to arise: an admiration for the Church that is full of childlike love and loyalty; and assurance of mind that is undismayed however grevious the accusations brought against the Church, even should these accusations be true; and the possession of a clue to the right understanding of problems connected with the Church in the present day. It gives also a *width of outlook and sympathy* that leads to the cultivation of the mind.[9]

The term: power of expression, so far as historical writing is concerned, is not synonymous with rhetoric. It is far better to present a subject with truth, clearness, and precision, unadorned by the art of rhetoric than a well-written essay filled with inaccuracies and faulty conclusions. Rhetoric is not to be despised, but if the style is exact, clear, moderate, in good taste, and elegant, and if the reader realizes that the principal thing which has guided his author is love for the

[8] JOHNSON, *op cit.*, p. 27.

[9] Cf. *The Teaching of Church History in Catholic Girls' Schools*, by a Religious of the Sacred Heart, pp. 10–13. Roehampton (London), 1917.

truth, the work in question is not far from perfection. James F. Rhodes, in his paper *Concerning the Writing of History*,[10] lays stress on originality: "An historian, to make a mark, must show some originality somewhere in his work." The best originality in the field of historical writing, now, as ever in the past, is the originality which seeks the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but what will clarify the truth. In the long dynasty of historians from Herodotus to our own day, very few deserve the *tulit praemium* for sheer honesty.

[10] *Annual Report of the American Historical Association*, Vol. i (1900), pp. 51–65.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here does not preclude extended notice in later issues of the* REVIEW)

ADAMS, GEORGE BURTON, Litt.D. *An Outline Sketch of Constitutional History.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1918. Pp. 208.

BESSIERERS, ALBERT, S.J., *De l'Art à la Foi: Jean Thorel*, 1859–1916. Paris: G. Beauchesne, 1917. Pp. viii+97.

BLACKMORE, REV. S. A., S.J. *The Riddles of Hamlet and the Newest Answers.* Boston: Stratford Co., 1917. Pp. vii+494.

BROWN, GEORGE DOBBIN. *Bibliography: Woodrow Wilson*, 1910–1917. Princeton: Princeton University, 1917. Pp. vi+52.

BURNS, REV. J. A., C.S.C., Ph.D. *Catholic Education: A Study of Conditions.* New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1917. Pp. ix+205.

COOPER, JOHN M. *Analytical and Critical Bibliography of the Tribes of Tierra del Fuego and Adjacent Territory.* Washington: Government Printing Office, 1917. Pp. ix+233.

CREIGHTON, LOUISE. *Life and Letters of Thomas Hodgkin.* New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1917. Pp. xii+445.

DELANY-FARRELLY-MEEHAN. *Historical Records and Studies.* New York: Published by the Society, 1917. Vol. xi, pp. 171.

DE TONQUEDEC, JOSEPH. *L'Oeuvre de Paul Claudel.* Paris: G. Beauchesne, 1917. Pp. 169.

FRANCISCAN SISTERS OF PERPETUAL ADORATION. *Our Country in Story.* New York: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1917. Pp. 336.

GITTINGER, ROY, Ph.D. *The Foundation of the State of Oklahoma*, 1803–1906. Berkeley: University Press, 1917. Pp. xii+256.

HEALY, T. M., M.P. *The Great Fraud of Ulster.* Dublin: Gill & Sons, 1917. Pp. xx+192.

HOCKETT, HOMER C. *Western Influences on Political Parties to* 1825. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1917. Pp. 157.

HOLT-CHILTON. *The History of Europe from* 1862 *to* 1914. New York: Macmillan Co., 1917. Pp. xv+611.

KELLOGG, LOUISE PHELPS. *Frontier Retreat on the Upper Ohio*, 1779–1781. Madison: Published by the Wisconsin State Historical Society, 1917. Pp. 549.

KIRLIN, J. L. J. *Catholicity in Philadelphia.* Philadelphia: J. J. McVey, 1909. Pp. xv+546.

LESLIE, SHANE. *The Irish Issue in Its American Aspect*, New York: Scribner's Sons, 1917. Pp. 207.

MAAS, P. OTTO, O.F.M. *Cartas de China.* Sevilla, 1917. Two vols. Pp. 190; viii+221.

MACLEAN, GEORGE EDWIN. *Studies in Higher Education in England and Scotland.* Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1917. Pp. 279.

MARBURG, THEODORE, M.A., LL.D. *League of Nations: A Chapter in the History of the Movement.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1917. Pp. 139.

MEERSCHAERT, THEOPHILUS. *Statuta Dioceseas Oklahomensis.* Oklahoma, 1913. Pp. xv+143.

MILLER-SCUDDER. *Wessel Gansfort, Life and Writings.* New York: Putnam Sons, 1917. Vol. i, pp. xvi+333; Vol. ii, pp. 369.

MONTGOMERY, JAMES A., Ph.D., S.T.D. *Religions of the Past and Present.* Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1918. Pp. 425.

MORIMOTO, KOKICHI, Ph.D. *The Standard of Living in Japan.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1918. Pp. vii+150.

PAETOW, LOUIS JOHN, Ph.D. *Guide to the Study of Medieval History.* California: University Press, 1917. Pp. xvi+552.

PINE, M. S. *A Glory of Maryland.* Philadelphia: Salesian Press, 1917. Pp. 88.

PUTNAM, RUTH. *California: The Name.* Berkeley: University Press, 1917. Pp. 293–365.

RELF, FRANCIS HELEN, Ph.D. *The Petition of Right.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1917. Pp. v+74.

ROBINSON-WEST. *The Foreign Policy of Woodrow Wilson, 1913–1917.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1917. Pp. 428.

SCHAFER, JOSEPH. *History of the Pacific Northwest.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1918. Pp. 323.

VINCENT, JOSE. *Frederic Mistral: Sa Vie Son Influence Son Action et Son Art.* Paris: G. Beauchesne, 1918. Pp. 321.

WALSH, JAMES J. *Catholic Churchmen in Science.* Philadelphia: Dolphin Press, 1917. Pp. ix+221.

WESTERGAARD, WELDEMAR, Ph.D. *The Danish West Indies: Under Company Rule* (1671–1754) New York: Macmillan Co., 1917. Pp. xxiv+359.

ZOLLMANN, CARL, LL.B. *American Civil Church Law.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1917. Pp. 473.

American Antiquarian Society at the Semi-Annual Meeting Held in Boston, April 11, 1917. Worcester: Published by the Society, 1917. Vol. xxvii, Part 1, pp. 274.

Correspondence of John Henry Newman with John Keble and Others, 1839–1845. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1917. Pp. viii+413.

Golden Jubilee of the Most Holy Redeemer Church, Rochester, N. Y., 1867–1917. Rochester, 1917. Pp. 136.